

ST-UV

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 487



MAY 27 to JUNE 28, 1919



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1919

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 487

MAY 27 TO JUNE 28, 1919



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1919

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

N. J. SINNOTT, Oregon, *Chairman.*

ADDISON T. SMITH, Idaho.
JOHN A. ELSTON, California.
BERTRAND H. SNELL, New York.
CHARLES A. NICHOLS, Michigan.
WILLIAM J. GRAHAM, Illinois.
JOHN M. BAER, North Dakota.
BENIGNO C. HERNANDEZ, New Mexico.
HAYES B. WHITE, Kansas.
WILLIAM N. VAILE, Colorado.
HENRY E. BARBOUR, California.

JOHN S. BENHAM, Indiana.
JOHN W. SUMMERS, Washington.
SCOTT FERRIS, Oklahoma.
EDWARD T. TAYLOR, Colorado.
JOHN E. RAKER, California.
JAMES H. MAPES, Utah.
JOHN N. TILLMAN, Arkansas.
HARRY L. GANDY, South Dakota.
HUGH S. HERSMAN, California.
PAUL B. JOHNSON, Mississippi.

EDWARD D. BALDWIN, *Clerk.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(Index of witnesses at end of volume.)

Statement of—	Page.
Hon. Frank W. Mondell, Representative from Wyoming-----	3, 23, 52
Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior-----	30
Thomas C. Atkeson, representative National Grange, Patrons of Hus- bandry-----	69
Hoyt Chamberlain, secretary National Civic Betterment League----	77
Henry Sterling, legislative agent American Federation of Labor-----	81
Hon. Charles B. Timberlake, Representative from Colorado-----	93
J. H. Richards, attorney from Boise, Idaho-----	97
Gen. Charles H. Cole, Boston, Mass., Twenty-sixth Division-----	105
Hon. Riley J. Wilson, Representative from Louisiana-----	113
Hon. A. P. Davis, Director Reclamation Service-----	121, 429, 480
H. F. Hunter, supervisor of agriculture, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad-----	130
John I. Gibson, Michigan Land Settlement Commission-----	147
D. V. Chisholm, legislative representative Spanish-American War Veterans-----	157
Col. McElroy, National Tribune, Grand Army of the Republic-----	159
Wilbur A. Nelson, secretary Tennessee Soldiers' Settlement Board---	167
Hon. William Kent, United States Tariff Commission-----	176
Hon. John N. Garner, Representative from Texas-----	187
Western Starr, Farmers' National Single Tax League-----	204
Carl Brannin, secretary Farmers' Single Tax League-----	222
Hon. F. R. Gooding, former governor of Idaho-----	228
Hon. J. B. A. Robertson, governor of Oklahoma-----	247
Hon. Frank Park, Representative from Georgia-----	255
H. Guy Hathorn, investment banker, Memphis, Tenn-----	260
Hon. D. W. Davis, governor of Idaho-----	271
Hon. Dick T. Morgan, Representative from Oklahoma-----	280
Hon. W. D. Boies, Representative from Iowa-----	294
Capt. Ellis Bashure, financial section, United States Army-----	328
E. Philip Rosenthal, Human Welfare Association-----	331
Hon. Herbert J. Drane, Representative from Florida-----	348
T. C. Atkeson, representative National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry--	351
Hon. Harry L. Gandy, Representative from South Dakota-----	381
Benjamin C. Marsh, Farmers' National Council-----	388
J. N. Cox, representing governor of Tennessee-----	415
Charles Springer, representing governor of New Mexico-----	416
Hon. J. W. Summers, Representative from Washington-----	423
Hon. John McDuffie, Representative from Alabama-----	424
Capt. K. S. Littlejohn, United States Engineers-----	471
Caleb R. Layton, Representative from Delaware-----	476
W. I. Drummond, chairman board governors, International Farm Congress-----	502
Hon. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War-----	518

Statement of—Continued	Page.
Hon. William R. Wood, Representative from Indiana.....	531
R. E. Shepherd, Jerome, Idaho.....	555
Mrs. Haviland H. Lund, secretary of the Forward-to-the-Land League...	558
Hon. Frank W. Mondell, Representative from Wyoming.....	595
Elwood W. Titus, representative New York State Federation of Farm Bureaus.....	618
John D. Miller, representative Dairymen's League.....	629
F. A. Saulsbury, president Ontario County Farm Bureau Association.....	630
Charles D. Porter, president Orleans County Farm Bureau Association....	631
Hon. Robert M. McCracken, former Representative from Idaho.....	643
Mr. Emile A. Lehmann, former private, Company D, Three hundred and twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Army.....	647
H. C. Hallam, publicity agent, Southern Settlement and Development Organization.....	653
Mrs. W. H. Oxley, representing herself, Washington, D. C.....	669
Hon. Scott Ferris, Representative from Oklahoma.....	677
J. J. Harris, president and general manager Big Horn Irrigation & Power Co., Montana.....	678
Hugh Jeffries, president American Military Reform Association.....	694
William L. Hansen, Salt Lake City, bishop and manager colonization department, Mormon Church.....	728
Hon. William W. Hastings, Representative from Oklahoma, letter from...	751
Hon. William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, letter from.....	755
W. R. Green, jr., Buhl, Idaho, formerly United States Army.....	761
J. Leo Meehan, chairman soldiers' settlement committee, Utah American Legion, letter from.....	778
Hon. William Spry, former governor of Utah.....	778
Appendix A.—Report of the Secretary of the Interior.	
Appendix B.—Report of Chairman N. J. Sinnott to the House of Representatives.	

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, May 27, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Honorable Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, this meeting has been called to consider the matter of the soldiers' settlement bill. We have a report from the Secretary of the Interior which will be printed in the hearings. Secretary Lane was to be here this morning, and also Mr. Mondell and Mr. Davis, and Mr. Cory. Mr. Mondell seems to be the only one here just at the present time, and if the committee wishes, we shall be pleased to hear him.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. MONDELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING.

MR. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to H. R. 487, a bill to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the "National Soldier Settlement Act."

The following is a copy of said H. R. 487:

A BILL To provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the "National Soldier Settlement Act."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies and have been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army Reserve, and former American citizens who served with, and were honorably separated or discharged from the military or naval forces of any of the nations allied against the Central Powers, and who have been repatriated, all of whom are hereinafter referred to as soldiers, there is hereby established a fund in the Treasury to be known as the "National Soldier Settlement Fund," hereinafter referred to as the "Fund," to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary," for the purposes herein stated and as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary is authorized to use the Fund for the purposes of this act. He may acquire by gift, purchase, deed in trust, or otherwise, the necessary lands for Soldier Settlement Projects, hereinafter referred to as "Projects," and may withdraw, utilize, and dispose of by contract and deed public lands suitable for such purposes. No lands shall be acquired, however, unless the price to be paid, and the conditions under which they are to be acquired shall be approved by (a) a representative of the Governor of the State in which the lands are located; (b) an appraiser designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board; and (c) the Secretary. Projects shall be selected with a view to the development of one or more projects in each of the several States in which feasible projects may be found.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary is authorized through such agencies as he may provide to engage in such undertakings and do and perform such work as in his opinion is necessary for the permanent reclamation or development of the lands of projects, and when he deems essential to place them in condition for use and cultivation, including the building of essential public roads. The Secretary shall, so far as possible, utilize the services of soldiers for such purposes.

The Secretary may also, through agreement with soldiers, make provision for necessary improvements, but the contribution from the fund shall in no single case exceed \$1,200, nor in excess of three-quarters of the cost or value of the improvements.

SEC. 4. That the lands of projects shall be subdivided into farms suitable for the support of a family and in the discretion of the Secretary into smaller farm workers' tracts. Dedication may be made for schools, churches, community centers, and other public purposes. Town sites suitable for the purposes of the project may be established, developed, and sold as provided herein.

SEC. 5. That soldiers who are not the owners or proprietors of farms or rural homes shall be eligible as purchasers of a farm or farm workers' tract. Preference shall be given to those who have been employed in the development of such projects, and as between applicants with a view of safeguarding the settler and the United States, so far as practicable, against loss or failure. The Secretary shall make regulations general in character, or applicable to specific projects, as to residence and cultivation with a view of carrying out the purpose of making the soldier settlements the permanent home of the soldier purchasers.

SEC. 6. That sale prices shall be fixed with a view of repaying the total cost of each project, and the price fixed for each farm, tract, or lot shall represent as nearly as practicable its relative and comparative selling value. Approved applicants shall at the time of entering into contract of purchase make a first payment of 5 per centum of the sale price. The balance shall be paid in amortizing payments extending over a period to be fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed forty years. Sums advanced for improvements shall be repaid in amortizing payments extending over a period to be fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed twenty years. The amortizing payments shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, payable annually, computed from date of contract. The contracts for the sale of the farms, tracts, and lots shall provide for cancellations and forfeitures of payments made under the contract for failure to comply therewith.

SEC. 7. Patents or deeds to project lands issued within ten years from the date of contract of sale shall contain the condition that no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease made during that period shall be valid without the approval of the Secretary, and no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary. The Secretary shall make all necessary regulations for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this act and for safeguarding the interests of the settler and of the United States, and is authorized to issue patents or deeds for the public and private lands embraced in farms, tracts, and lots within projects.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary is also authorized to make short-time loans from the fund, not to exceed \$800 at any one time, to a soldier settler for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, and provision shall be made for the repayment of such loans during a period not to exceed five years with interest on deferred payments at 4 per centum per annum, payable annually, computed from date of contract: *Provided*, That no such loans shall exceed 60 per centum of the cost of the live stock and equipment purchased.

SEC. 9. That whenever any State shall provide funds to be expended in co-operation with the United States to provide rural homes for soldiers, the Secretary shall have authority to enter into contracts for such cooperation, and when the State shall furnish 25 per centum of the necessary funds the Secretary may authorize the State, subject to his general supervision, to carry on the subdivision of the land, improvement of farms, and the aid and direction of development after settlement. The Secretary is authorized to provide for reimbursement of funds so advanced by the State. He may also cooperate with other agencies to the extent he may deem advisable and likewise provide for reimbursement to them of funds advanced.

SEC. 10. That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act the sum of \$500,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, since long before the close of the war, public-spirited men have had in mind what we might be able to do for our returning soldiers and sailors in the way of affording them opportunities to secure homes on the lands. Ours has always been a land of wonderful opportunity in the matter of acquiring homes. At the close of the Civil War, the returning soldiers of both armies formed the vanguard of a movement of settlement and development that is without parallel in the history of the world. That has been true at the close of every war of the Republic since Revolutionary times. Within a year after the signing of the armistice, at least twice as many men will bid farewell to the Colors and return to their homes as formed the armies on both sides of the Civil War, but the opportunities that awaited those soldiers no longer exist. It is true that in many parts of the West, there are still homestead opportunities, but the lands are not as fair and favorably situated as the lands of the Mississippi Valley. Still, in view of the fact that we are granting them to the soldiers in larger areas than formerly, they do afford opportunities for those who desire to engage in the character of agriculture which can be successfully carried on on the dry lands. There are some opportunities under the reclamation projects; splendid opportunities so far as they exist. There are still areas of cheap lands in the country, although such areas are becoming smaller and less numerous all the time; and in view of the large number of men who are returning, the opportunities to secure lands and homes will not meet the demand unless the Federal Government affords some aid in the matter.

These matters were all considered, as I said at the beginning, even before the signing of the armistice by a great many people who are interested in the general welfare of the soldiers and who are interested in the general development of the country. The Secretary of the Interior took up the matter very early and very eloquently, and urged it very forcibly. Members of Congress introduced bills. The present chairman of this committee Mr. Sinnott introduced a bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Morgan, introduced a bill. The then chairman of this committee, Mr. Ferris, had the matter under consideration. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Taylor, introduced a bill which went to the Committee on Irrigation and was favorably reported. A bill was introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Byrnes, and went to the Committee on Appropriations. I introduced a similar bill which went to the Committee on Appropriations. I think some other gentlemen introduced bills. I do not remember all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Raker introduced a bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; Mr. Raker introduced a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. And I notice from this morning's record that Mr. Tillman also introduced a bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Tillman has also introduced a bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Smith of Idaho also introduced a similar bill with reference to reclamation projects.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true. Almost every man from the western country, and many from other parts of the country, who have a special interest in these matters, were active in promoting the proposition of soldier-land settlements, but the Congress which expired the

4th of March was a war Congress. It had to do with war matters. It did not have the time to take up the matters of reconstruction, restoration and development. So that comes before this Congress.

At the close of the recent Congress, I remained in Washington, and, taking advantage of all that had been said and all that had been done, and all that had been suggested and proposed in speeches and arguments and bills, I set to work to draft, or to aid in drafting a bill which would embrace what seemed to be the best features of the various suggestions that had been made, with a view to presenting them in a concrete, and definite form.

I conferred with many Members on both sides of the House; in fact, all of the Members who had evinced a particular interest in the matter who were then in Washington. I conferred with the officials of the Interior Department, with the Secretary of the Interior, and with gentlemen who he had called to his aid, among others Mr. Cory and Mr. Smythe. At my request, and as it developed later at the request of the Secretary of the Interior also, Mr. Elwood Mead, who perhaps, has had more experience in land-settlement work than any man in America, or in Australia, where he did a great deal of his work, came on from Berkeley and aided with suggestions in the formulation of the legislation. So the bill you have before you is my bill only in the sense that I availed myself of all of the suggestions that had been made and that had been urged in regard to the legislation, and tried to put in a clear and concise form what seemed, after consultation, to be the plan that commended itself to a majority of the gentlemen who had given the matter consideration; after a tentative bill had thus been drafted, in cooperation and in consultation, a meeting was held at the office of the Secretary of the Interior, at which all of the Members who had been active in this matter, who were then in the city, were present.

Some of the gentlemen who have been very active were not present at that particular meeting, simply because they had not then arrived in Washington prior to the assembling of Congress. But at the Secretary's office we had a meeting of representative men of the House and of the Senate and of the department. Some suggestions of amendment or change were made and agreed upon there, and the bill which is now before you is the measure that was then tentatively agreed upon. I do not mean to say that any of the gentlemen there present are absolutely bound by every provision in this bill. I think all have open minds with regard to every provision of it; but from the examination that we were able to give it, with the light we had, with the suggestions that we had received from the gentlemen who had introduced bills and gentlemen who had discussed the matter, we present to you the product of our best judgment for your consideration.

Now, briefly, as to the plan and purpose of the bill. It is proposed to secure by purchase, gift, by deed, or in some other manner areas of land in the various States and in all of the various States where such lands are available in sufficient areas when divided into farms to form complete and comparatively independent communities—

Mr. SNELL (interposing). Do you want us to ask you questions as you go along or would you prefer that we should wait until you get through?

Mr. MONDELL. Would you mind letting me complete my first statement, in the meantime making a memorandum of those things you have in mind, because I may answer what you have in mind as I go along.

The community settlement idea is at the bottom of this legislation. It is believed that development by communities is essential; that only in that way can we reclaim large areas of land that are now comparatively useless, but contain all the essential elements of fertility when they are made available; lands that while they are not now available for intensive cultivation and successful use by reclamation in the various forms that may be necessary, depending upon the character of the area, may be made very desirable and very attractive places of residence and successful farming communities.

I am emphasizing this feature of the matter because that is the very base of this soldier-settlement bill—the community idea. If the thought on which this bill is based and on which practically all of the bills have been based, as I understand it, is carried out, no development will be attempted where there is not available a sufficient area of suitable land for a good-sized, comparatively independent community, and the development will be with such reservations for towns and community centers as may be necessary to foster and develop and maintain the community idea.

It is believed that areas of this sort can be found in almost every State of the Union except possibly some of the unusually fortunate States of the Mississippi Valley, where practically all of the lands are now under successful cultivation. There may be a few States that will not furnish areas such as we have in mind, but most of them will. As a matter of fact, curiously enough, one of the projects that is being tentatively considered, I am told, is within 25 miles of Boston where, as the cheap, virgin lands of the West beckoned, these lands of the early Pilgrim fathers were abandoned, and yet those lands are susceptible of development at a reasonable cost for fertilization, clearing, leveling, etc., in a way to make them very attractive and very profitable farming communities.

To go a little further on the community idea, and as to the importance of it, most of the gentlemen here know something about pioneering and the development of the West. It is not so long ago that the Mississippi Valley was a pioneer country. It was when I was a boy. People do not mind exercising unusual economies, being unusually careful in expenditure or working unusually long hours and undergoing rather unusual privations if everyone in the community is doing the same thing, and they are doing it for themselves. That is what has developed the West. That is what has developed the country from the Alleghenies to the Pacific. You all know what the pioneers have gone through and suffered. We do not expect that the pioneers on these projects shall be required to go through what the pioneers that I lived with as a boy did, and as the pioneers of to-day are doing in many parts of the West; but educated people, people who have been accustomed to the best of things, have cheerfully, thankfully, and hopefully gone through all of the work of pioneering because all their neighbors were doing the same. They were inspired by the splendid spirit of pioneer development. There is nothing more inspiring in the world than the laying of foundations, making two blades of grass grow where only one or none grew

before, or making useful plants grow where only comparatively useless plants grew before; building new communities, establishing new institutions, and developing all of the institutions of a civilized, prosperous community in regions where the land has been largely unused and uninhabited.

Under the pioneer idea, with the spirit of the pioneer which we hope to infuse into these communities, wonderful things can be done which could not be accomplished at all if you attempted to aid the individual here and there and elsewhere, surrounded by people who are very comfortably situated, who are riding around in their high-powered automobiles, who have made their way in the world and have established themselves. It is not pleasant to have to live differently from your neighbors. It is a perfect joy to join with your neighbors in developing a country. Every man who has lived in the West can bear testimony to that fact, and the West in this respect has meant anywhere beyond the Alleghenies in the recollection of someone still living.

Now the thought is that after these areas have been secured, arid in the West, cut over in the Northwest and in parts of the South, overflowed or partly overflowed in some sections, abandoned in others, the soldiers and sailors will be invited to aid in the work of developing and restoring them. They will be paid good wages in that work of development and they will be given to understand that under the provisions of the bill the man who works on the project, and incidentally the man who works longest on the project, because that would be within the discretion of the Secretary, shall have the preference in the selection of tracts when they shall be divided. In the development of these projects it is proposed to utilize the splendid organization of the Reclamation Service, expanding and enlarging, increasing and extending it. It is expected that the work shall be done with the very best organization that can be had with the very best appliances that are available, and with the best skill that can be secured toward the development of each one of these projects into a condition where they shall be fit for successful cultivation and for the establishment of homes. This will mean the pulling of stumps in some places and the building of dams in others, levees elsewhere, and a great variety of work.

Under the provisions of this bill, as it stands—and this is a rather important matter—the Secretary may go into this work of development as far as he deems it essential to go, in order to place the lands in condition where the individual can with his own labor utilize them for farming purposes.

That will mean that in some cases it will be necessary to do a considerable amount of work in leveling, grubbing, and clearing, in addition to the first initial work of reclamation. In other places where the lands are comparatively level, where the brush is small and the individual can clear it, it will not be necessary for the Government to go further than is necessary to put the land in condition where the individual can begin farming operations and complete his own additional work of clearing and reclamation, whatever it may be.

The CHAIRMAN. That may also include the drainage of lands, or the drainage of wet lands?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; of course that is one of the very important features of the plan. Some of the areas taken up will be overflowed lands or lands that are subject to overflow and that are tremendously rich when reclaimed. They can be made entirely sanitary by very simple means. From one to three years will elapse from the time a project is undertaken to the time when the lands can be subdivided into farms of the size deemed necessary for the support of a family. During that period, if the soldier is reasonably diligent and fairly saving, he can, even though he start without any savings, save enough to make the initial payment of five per cent on his farm, which will be \$250 in the case of a tract costing \$5,000. The farms are to be priced in accordance with their value as compared with the value of the other farms, and with a view of returning the total cost of reclamation and development. If \$5,000,000 be expended on a project, the total of the farm values fixed for sale purposes must be \$5,000,000, and the price fixed on each farm must be a price which measures its selling value as compared with the other farms. It will require judgment and intelligence of a high order to determine those values, but, of course, that is essential if we are to dispose of the tracts. Some of the tracts will, of course, be much more attractive than others, and, of course, the attractive lands must bear the higher price in order that equity shall be done among all the purchasers.

The bill also provides for farm workers' tracts. That is in line with what has been done in Australia and in California, where they have found that there are certain men who prefer to work for others on a farm rather than actually farm for themselves, further than having a home and a garden where they can raise vegetables, fruits, poultry, and that sort of thing. Those tracts would also be available for mechanics of the village community, and it is believed that those tracts will be very helpful in the development of a project. They will be located, naturally, about the village settlement or community center. When the time arrives for the sale of the farms which have been divided the soldier who has worked on a project or on projects of that kind has the preference, and, naturally, as I said a moment ago, in the discretion of the Secretary, the soldier who had shown the most industry and interest might be given a preference over one who had not worked so long or, perhaps, so faithfully. Acting within his discretion the Secretary would dispose of the tracts. The purpose is to maintain those settlements as the homes of the soldiers who purchase, and to prevent, if possible, the purchase of the lands by outsiders or the consolidation of the farms.

With that object in view, it is provided that there can be no transfer before the Government's obligation is met without the permission of the Secretary, and that, in addition to that, there can be no transfer within 10 years after the sale without the permission of the Secretary. That is to meet a case where a community might be particularly prosperous and men might be tempted to realize on the increment and dispose of their land by paying off the Government obligation. Those are all matters for your consideration, and I am simply stating the provisions of the bill, as you will note them as you read them.

When a soldier has picked out his tract and paid his 5 per cent, in a majority of cases, or in many cases, he will need assistance in the matter of building his house, and provision is made for giving him such assistance up to \$1,200, but that assistance can not be in excess of three-fourths of the cost or value of the improvements. In other words, if a soldier wants a house and barn which will cost \$1,600, a contract might be made with him to make those improvements for \$1,200, the amount which the Government advances, he contributing the equivalent of \$400 in labor, or he might have enough cash to meet the difference between the amount the Government advances and the amount which the improvements cost in order to reasonably secure the Government in its investment.

Plans of buildings will be worked out by the service suitable to the locality; there would, of course, be plans of buildings at various costs, and these plans would be available to the settlers with a view of enabling them to select the character of buildings they may desire. The service would, of course, give the settler assistance in the matter of cooperative buying of building material, and in every possible way aid him in the development of his property. After the soldier has constructed such buildings as he may deem essential, in many cases he will need some further assistance in the purchase of live stock, implements, and tools, and section 8 of the bill authorizes short-time loans not to exceed \$800 to secure stock and equipment; and there is a provision that no such loan shall exceed 40 per cent of the value of the live stock and equipment. In the matter of payments the bill provides for payments over a period of 40 years on the lands, over a period of 20 years on the improvements, and over a period of 5 years upon advances for live stock and equipment, all at 4 per cent.

Those are the most important features of the bill, and I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up any further the time of the committee in a general explanation. I will, however, be glad to answer any questions that gentlemen may have to ask with regard to any feature of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are on the general statement, can you explain the difference between your bill and, for instance, the Ferris bill, which is identical with the Raker and Taylor bills?

Mr. MONDELL. It would be difficult to fully explain the difference in detail between this bill and any or all of the other bills, and if one started to explain the difference between this bill and one of the others, it would be rather essential to explain the difference between this bill and all of the others. However, I can say this, that I think there is no essential difference in the thought and purpose underlying this bill and the thought and purpose that the gentlemen had in mind when they prepared the other bills that have been presented. Under the bill introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Taylor, and, I presume under the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Ferris, about all that is proposed in this bill could have been accomplished. The plan or general purpose is the same. As I said at the beginning, I and those with whom I labored and collaborated had the benefit of all of those suggestions, and our endeavor was to put in concrete form what gentlemen had proposed, and what it was difficult to work out in a detailed way without more

investigation, suggestion, and cooperation than anyone had the advantage of six months ago. I could not have written this bill except for the suggestions that had been made in former bills, and our labor, my own and that of the gentlemen I have mentioned, was to put in concrete form and in logical sequence provisions that would carry out the ideas that many folks have had in their minds from the beginning in connection with this matter of soldier settlements.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that your bill confines the relief or the homes to soldiers who participated in the war with Germany.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. While the other bills, as I understand them, provide homes for all soldiers.

Mr. MONDELL. I followed that plan in my original draft. I did not have an opportunity to confer with all of the gentlemen who had introduced bills, but after a conference among the gentlemen who were here, it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that while some former bills did not definitely limit the relief to soldiers of the Great War, that was believed to be what all of them had in mind. I do not know as to that, and that is for the gentlemen of the committee to determine. In the first draft of my bill, I followed in this respect the phraseology of another bill, which, I think, would have included soldiers other than those of the Great War.

The CHAIRMAN. I noticed a few other provisions, to which, if you will permit me, I should like to call your attention, so that you can make a general statement in regard to them. The other bills provide for the condemnation of land, while your bill does not.

Mr. MONDELL. I have omitted that from the bill for this reason: In the first place there is a good deal of difference of opinion as to the right of the Federal Government to go into a State and condemn lands for such purposes. If this is done at all it must be done, of course, under the State laws. I do not think that it is necessary to begin this great work by writing into the law a provision that some people may not like and that might appear offensive to some—as though we were proposing to condemn people's homes and farms. I think it will be entirely unnecessary. I do think that in carrying out the provisions of the bill you will find that in many of the States the tracts that may be needed, for instance, for reclamation, for drainage, and that sort of thing may be condemned under the State laws without any definite provision in this legislation. We condemn now under the reclamation law. There is no provision in the reclamation law for condemnation, if I recollect rightly, but in every arid State they have provided for condemnation for public purposes, among which is the use of water for the irrigation of lands. Most of the States, I imagine, that have swampy or overflowed areas have such legislation. If they have not, that is something for us to meet in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. There is another matter I want to call your attention to: Your bill excludes soldiers who are now the owners or proprietors of farms or rural homes.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. That is a very general proposition, and it differs from the other suggestions that have been made, which were of a very great variety and which were more or less specific. It may develop as time passes that we may find soldiers who have small

places that they perhaps ought to keep and still have a right to acquire one of these farms. That is a matter of discretion, and the language is descriptive. The Secretary under that provision would have some considerable discretion; but it states the view that I had in mind. Our purpose was to provide rural homes for those who were not otherwise provided for in the way of farms or rural homes. If a soldier has such property and wants to secure a home on a project, he can sell it and use the proceeds to help in buying and improving the new home. Of course, it is a matter for the committee to consider and determine whether that language should be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 8 of the Ferris bill provides for the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of war material.

Mr. MONDELL. There is a general provision of law which will be carried in the sundry civil bill, and possibly in the deficiency bill, for the sale of war material to various Government agencies. Now, let us not lose sight of this fact: This is not a bounty, this is not a pension, and this is not a gratuity; we are going to do everything on earth for our soldiers except to rob them of their self-respect. We will not do that. Nothing would have that effect more than to hold out the hope that the Government was giving some favored soldiers farms. That is not our purpose at all. We have outlined a plan under which the earnest and industrious man may secure a farm, and secure it with his own efforts if he is ordinarily fortunate. There is no doubt but that there is material of that kind that can be used, but if we get the material from the War Department, or get it anywhere else, we ought to pay for it. Of course we will not pay a high price for it because the war material would be taken over at a price agreed upon. Therefore, this fund will undoubtedly acquire quite a considerable amount of engineering and tractor material at a very low figure, but it will be charged to the fund under that general provision.

Mr. RAKER. In that connection, of course, it would not be a gift to the soldiers and it would not be offered that way, but would it not be better to take over all of that material that can be used by the Reclamation Service that the War Department now has rather than sell it at a great sacrifice?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and that is the purpose of the general measure to which I have referred, before it is sold all the various agencies of the Government shall be considered, and the sale and transfer of such material as they require shall be made to them.

Mr. SMITH. It is merely a matter of bookkeeping, or the charging of one fund and crediting of another.

Mr. MONDELL. It is more than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. This provision was put in there, and I think I put it in myself, because the Secretary of War deliberately ordered something like 75,000,000 pounds of T. N. T. thrown into the Atlantic Ocean, and it was through desperate efforts made, largely on my part and on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, that it was not done. I went to see the Secretary of War and prevailed upon him to turn that T. N. T. over to the Secretary of the Interior for use in this reclamation work.

When this war was over, we had a large amount of explosives that was dangerous to keep in storage, and the War Board decided, as I understand it, that if there was no use for it the saf-

est thing to do would be to destroy it. When I learned about that, my thought was that it could be used in this work and that it would be a great industrial saving. We have some 25,000,000 pounds which was shipped to Wingate, N. Mex., and stored there for the purposes of this work. It is worth 40 cents per pound, but will cost the Reclamation Service only about 4 cents per pound. They have a lot of tractors and other thing that we need.

Mr. MONDELL. Leaving that provision out of the bill would not prevent taking over material, because the general provision of law to which I have referred will provide for this agency as well as all other agencies. They can take over that material and it can be turned over to the Reclamation Service, the Forest Service, and all other services of the Government. My thought was simply this, that we should not in this bill take over some Government property without paying some sort of price for it. If that stuff is worth only 4 cents per pound, let us give the War Department the benefit of that 4 cents. They are entitled to their salvage, no matter how small it is, and we are entitled to buy it at the salvage price. If we are going to conduct a businesslike enterprise, I do not want to see any tractors or other material turned over to the Reclamation Service gratis. If they are worth \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 or a thousand dollars, let up pay it just as the other agencies will have to pay.

Mr. RAKER. This is the thing that appealed to me; I know from personal observation that the War Department in England is disposing of what we have there in a splendid manner, but in France it is a question of whether we shall get anything for our expenditures. They will not respect us and will not think as much of us if we turn it over to them for nothing. That property had better be returned here for use rather than give it away, and my idea was to take the matter up with the War Department so that if they can not dispose of the material over there, it may be returned here for use. They will respect us more if they are required to pay for it. There is a lot of truck and machinery of all kinds, and we ought not to let it go undisposed of.

Mr. MONDELL. The bill containing the general provision to which I have referred will be considered in the House, and you gentlemen can then determine the matter.

Mr. MAYS. You have in section 2 of your bill a provision that permits the Secretary to acquire by gift, purchase, deed in trust, or otherwise the necessary lands for soldier settlement projects, etc. Do you wish to retain that in the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I do not suppose that anybody will give anything that is tremendously valuable. There may be cases where there are small properties involved which would be donated, but I do not imagine that anybody will give anything to this fund that is very valuable. That was in the various bills, and I left it in. I think we will get a good deal of property by deed of trust.

Mr. VAILE. Would this not be open to the objection that it would be in the form of a gratuity to the soldier, as in the case of the transfer of materials from the War Department? If an individual desires to contribute to the fund, I do not imagine anyone would object.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentlemen of the committee can determine what they want to do about that. I have simply stated my view. My thought is that under the general provision of law relative to the

disposition of war material, the various Government departments will first be furnished all they need and all they can use and all they demand at a fair price. That, in my opinion, is the fairest provision both for the War Department and for the other services. The War Department is entitled to salvage values, no matter how small they may be, because they will help them to make a showing. Of course, it will be a very small price as compared with the cost. For instance, in the matter of powder it will be but a fraction, or perhaps not 10 per cent of the cost. At any event, we should pay the salvage price for it. I do not think that is vitally important, and I will be perfectly content with anything the committee does on that subject. I shall support the bill whatever you may do in regard to that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is another difference that may be more apparent than real: The Ferris and other bills provide specifically for a lien to secure the repayments, while yours does not provide any, unless it is contained in the general language.

Mr. MONDELL. The general language that was drawn in reference to repayments was drawn in the Interior Department; as a matter of fact, I did not think any specific legislation was necessary. I think that falls under the general authority granted in section 1.

Mr. ELSTON. The contract itself is a lien.

Mr. MONDELL. The contract, of course, is a lien. First, there is a contract of sale which is a lien. Then when you come to the improvements there is a mortgage. Then when you come to the matter of the personal property, whatever the Government has advanced is secured by property of more value, I doubt if any specific language is necessary to accomplish that, but the gentlemen of the Interior Department thought it was, and it is in the bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. You favor the retention of a lien, of course.

Mr. MONDELL. There must be, of course, a lien. In other words, we must carry on this work in a businesslike way.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 9 of your bill provides for cooperation with the State and the taking over of a project by the State in some way. I should like to have you expatiate on that.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me say to the committee that that is a matter I have not given as much study to as some others, but my thought was this: This bill does not create a revolving fund. Whatever you make available for appropriation under the bill, whether it is the sum mentioned in the bill or a larger or smaller sum, it would be expected to be the limit of Federal obligation under this class of work, I think it is a reasonable expectation, that during the period of this Federal development the States and private individuals would take up this class of work, particularly the States. Quite a number of the States have already taken up the matter and in one way or another have evidenced their interest and made provision for more or less cooperation. I have in mind the State of Arkansas whose offer of cooperation I saw just a day or two ago. In order to encourage that sort of cooperation it would be well to make some provision under which, in the discretion of the Secretary, under given circumstances, the State might cooperate at least in the management. I want to say to the committee frankly that so far as that paragraph is concerned, while I think it is tremendously important, one of the most important features of the bill, I do not pretend to say that the

provision we have made is just the exact provision you should make.

Mr. RAKER. Your intention is, is it not, that all the money the Government advances eventually will come back into the Treasury?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And if Congress sees fit and the projects are a success, as we feel quite satisfied they will be, money can be reappropriated for additional work if Congress so desires.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course it will be up to the future Congresses to say what will be done. It seemed to be the opinion of practically everyone that we should not now create a revolving fund, but that we should dedicate a certain sum which we believed would be sufficient to carry out the projects that now seem available in the States and complete them. None of us can look into the future. It may be that this work will be carried on so successfully, will be so helpful and so useful in development, that the Federal Government may want to carry it on. We feel very confident that in any event, whether we are particularly successful or not, the States will take the matter up, and that individuals will, and that the work that is done under the Federal Government organization will be helpful as pointing the way to do those things that are wise and possibly erecting a sign-post against taking the roads that lead to trouble and difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell, there is another matter I wish you would explain for the benefit, particularly, of the new members.

Your bill in section 10 provides for an authorization. I wish you would explain the difference between an authorization and an appropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I suppose we all understand that this is not an appropriating committee and that therefore you can not appropriate moneys. You can authorize the appropriation of moneys. If this bill passes, it will then be the duty of the Committee on Appropriations, under estimate presented by the Secretary of the Interior through the Treasury Department, to make the initial appropriation in the amount deemed necessary for carrying on the first year's work.

M. ELSTON. In other words, Mr. Mondell, although this is an authorization for \$500,000,000 the first appropriation for this current year need not necessarily be the full amount; it might be much less.

Mr. MONDELL. My thought is at this time, and I do not make that suggestion as at all conclusive or as intended to bind anybody, that \$100,000,000 or \$125,000,000 at the most, is all that could be economically expended within a year. It may be that the department by the time the bill passes may have worked out plans to the point where they may conclude they could use a larger sum advantageously or they may conclude they will need a lesser amount the first year. Manifestly, it would not be wise to appropriate an enormous sum of money and go to spending it recklessly. The success of this enterprise depends upon its being carried out in a business-like way. If we are going to do anything that is worth while, if we are going to help the soldiers to get property and to get a farm and a farm home, and retain his self-respect in getting it, this entire matter must be carried out in a thoroughly business-like way.

Mr. BAER. Right there, Mr. Mondell, do you not think in order to carry it out in that way, and inasmuch as we have found that many appropriations have not been carried out in the past in a very business-like way, some commission or board composed of engineers and actual business men should be appointed to supervise the expenditure of this money?

Mr. MONDELL. My thought is that it is true that mistakes may be made; it is true that some mistakes are inevitable, but we must in all these things trust some one, and personally, I would rather trust one man—that is, make him responsible—than to trust a board so constituted that each could swear the failure off onto the other. I would rather hold the Secretary responsible. While this bill does not specifically place this work under the Reclamation Service, as some of the bills did, my understanding is, and I think there is no doubt about it, the work will be inaugurated under the Reclamation Service and under its organization. What it may be wise to do after the work is started and under way is, of course, another matter, and it is in view of the possibility of the development of a situation rendering it wise to separate the services that this bill does not specifically limit the operation to the organization of the Reclamation Service.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Mondell, there has been a matter which I have had in my mind now for some months. In the bill which I introduced, H. R. 415, which is practically the same as the others, there is this provision:

The Secretary may make appropriate regulations as to the area obtainable by individual applicants as to residence and actual cultivation.

In your bill, in section 5, there is this language:

The Secretary shall make regulations general in character, or applicable to specific projects, as to residence and cultivation with a view of carrying out the purpose of making the soldier settlements the permanent home of the soldier purchasers.

I would like to know your views on this question and I would like to get them fully before the committee so they may be discussed when the Secretary and others come before the committee; and that is, whether or not it is the intent of this language to allow the Secretary to fix the question of whether there should be actual residence upon each tract of land or whether that is to be in his discretion.

Mr. MONDELL. There was a good deal of discussion of that, Mr. Raker, and it is a matter with regard to which, as you realize, there is room for a very great deal of difference of opinion. Some of the bills have specifically provided for a certain amount of residence, either by provision in the bill or by reference to the homestead laws. My thought was that these projects will be all the way from Florida to Maine, and from North Dakota to Arizona. Conditions will be tremendously diversified. A residence provision applicable to the Northwest in which the homestead lands lie might not be applicable to a situation in Mississippi or Georgia, where a requirement of residence at one period of the year might be wise rather than residence of a certain number of months within the year. There might be projects where the requirement of residence could be shorter than at other places. A man in the Northwest can only raise one crop and there are circumstances under which it is just as well for him to

be away for a considerable part of the time. On the other hand, in the case of a project in the South, if it is to be successful at all, the man must be there during all the growing season. There might be a difference of opinion. What I have done is this—and I leave it to the judgment of you gentlemen to determine as you see fit—to declare the purpose that of making the soldier settlement the permanent home of the soldier purchasers. Under that declaration, within his discretion, the Secretary may make regulations which may be general or specific.

Mr. RAKER. What I want to do is to get your view on the matter, and later the view of the committee, as to whether you believe it advisable under any circumstances to permit the obtaining of a home under any of these projects and then permit regulations to be promulgated or authority to be extended by the Secretary of the Interior, whereby the homesteader—and that is what I want to call him—could live in a town and not live upon his farm or home; that is, not make his home his permanent place of abode. Before the committee gets through I want to be heard on that subject, because, while you may not all agree with me, my view on the matter has been entirely changed in the last two months. Our form of living in the United States is different in reference to this community home business, and while I have heard the statements of the Secretary and the rest, from personal observation I want to give my views upon the effect it will have upon this country to establish community centers and permit these men to have their homes in the community and then have their farms outside, and I want to get Mr. Mondell's views on the question of whether or not he believes that each homesteader, under this law, should maintain for some length of time, at least, a residence and have his house and his surrounding equipment upon his own farm, rather than permit him to obtain a residence in the city and then farm his land from that point. I want to get that fully before the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that, because that is exactly one of the things I had in mind in drafting the language of this provision, and if you will note the language, you will see it authorizes the soldier to live anywhere in the settlement. The thought is that the Secretary shall require the soldier to live in the settlement. My thought is that in the development of these settlements the soldier whose land is adjacent to the community center may desire to live in the community center. That is a very common mode of life in Europe, and we have had it illustrated in our own country very largely in the West in the Mormon settlements, where it has tended to develop a desirable rural life.

Mr. RAKER. That is the point.

Mr. MONDELL. The purpose is to make the soldier settlement the permanent home of the soldier.

Mr. RAKER. I know I am opposed—

Mr. MONDELL. And I would confine him to the soldier settlement, but I would not necessarily confine him to the particular piece of land that he bought. Under this language the Secretary may make such provision as he sees fit, requiring a residence in the settlement for a certain number of months each year.

Mr. RAKER. In order that the committee will keep their minds open on that question, I should like to present some matters on that point, and I hope they will be fairly considered, so that we do not adopt the old world theory, because after an observation of this matter, where they have been living in that way for 2,000 years, you will find that we have advanced 1,000 per cent over them where in this country they have had separate homes, in comparison with the community settlements in Italy and in France. I just want to make some observations on that before the question is settled, and before we make up our minds definitely on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell, I should like to call your attention to lines 3 and 4 in section 1. I suppose that language was put in there advisedly and with reference to its technical meaning. I wish you would explain just how comprehensive or elastic that language is, "Those who have served with the military or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. Smith has just called to my attention that it would not include the boys who served on the border during the Mexican trouble, and I should like to know how comprehensive that language is.

Mr. MONDELL. This bill as it stands now would include every individual man or woman who served in any capacity in or with the armed forces of the United States in connection with the war with the Imperial German Government. It would include the nurses who enlisted. It would include the yeomanettes, if they were enlisted. It would include any one who served with the armed forces in connection with the war with Germany. If you want to go further than that you will have to broaden the language.

Mr. RAKER. Would that include all those who served in the Navy, whether they went abroad or not?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. There are some folks who think you never include everybody unless you name everybody, and if you start in naming all the different forces you will never reach the end of it, because you will always find some fellow who thinks of somebody who is not named. The military and naval forces of the United States includes everybody who served in an enlisted way or under commission.

The CHAIRMAN. It must be "in an enlisted way."

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; or commissioned; he must have actually been in the service.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mondell, why do you want to limit this legislation to those who were engaged with the Military or Naval Establishments since we declared war and up to the present time? What about the boys who went on the Mexican border? Hundreds went down there and were discharged probably a day or so before war was declared, yet they were down there for six or eight months; and what about the Spanish-American War men?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Smith, if you will allow me, I do not want to argue that question, but I will leave that to the judgment of the committee. I have told the committee what I did and what I thought about it. The bill as I originally drafted it would have included everybody who served in any of our wars, a revolutionary hero, if he was still on earth; but I did not believe it was wise to do it; I simply adopted language that had been used, and after I got to discussing the matter with some gentlemen they said, "The men who

have used the broad language have not intended, in our opinion, to include anybody except the soldiers of the Great War, and this includes all who served in the Great War." If you want to go beyond that and take in men who served before the Great War, and men who served in the Spanish-American War, and here and there and elsewhere, you will have to amend the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose a man came from California and was drafted and sent into a cantonment, and was there three months and became sick and could not be sent abroad, and then the armistice came along and he was discharged; would he be covered by this language?

Mr. MONDELL. How would you describe him if you did not describe him in this way. He went into the service, and it does not make any difference if he did not serve but three minutes; if he enlisted and was discharged honorably he is included, and it does not make any difference where it was.

Mr. BAER. That word "enlisted" is a bad word there.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like you to explain, Mr. Mondell, a little more fully the question of cooperation by the States in this matter.

Mr. MONDELL. If you will allow me, there are a number of gentlemen here who can do that very much better than I can. While I have some general views on the subject and believe very strongly as to the importance of it, and realize how anxious the States are to do it, so far as the details of that sort of thing are concerned, there are many gentlemen who can inform you and enlighten you in regard to that better than I can. I do not believe I am particularly an expert along that line, if I am in any.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask you another question as to who are included in this language. The rest, of course, I presume understand this, but I do not, and it never does any harm to fully answer these questions. Would this include a man who enlisted in the naval service and was in there say a month and was then discharged?

Mr. MONDELL. If he was honorably discharged or separated.

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; or a man who was separated from the service. That means a man who resigned, an officer. These bills contained all sorts and kinds of descriptions and the thought was to secure a description that was brief and definite and all inclusive.

Mr. RAKER. This would then include the yeomenettes, the young ladies who entered the service and served from one month to two years, if they desired to take advantage of it.

Mr. MONDELL. Or two minutes if she actually got into the service and was honorably separated or discharged.

Mr. TILMAN. You have followed the plan pursued in legal pleadings, that by being comprehensive you thereby embrace all the various elements.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. We found that if we tried to detail them there was always somebody left out.

Mr. RAKER. If the chairman and the committee will pardon me, I would like to ask another question as to whom it includes. Does it include or would it include the members of the Salvation Army?

Mr. MONDELL. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Let me finish my question, please. Or the members of the Y. M. C. A. or the members of the Red Cross, who went across

and went to the front and actually participated in doing this work, some of whom were killed in the performance of their work.

Mr. MONDELL. It would not.

Mr. RAKER. There is no provision in this bill that would include them?

Mr. MONDELL. No; and no provision in any other bill that was introduced by the gentleman from California or anybody else that would include them.

Mr. RAKER. Sometimes I overlook my hand. Would there be any objection, in your mind—

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). Please do not ask me that question, because I will not answer it. I have told you what the bill does, and I shall be perfectly satisfied with what the committee does, either in the way of limiting or expanding it. The provision in the bill is clear and definite. It includes everybody that has a record of service in the Great War, if it is only for one minute.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. What about boys 18, 19, or 20 years of age?

Mr. MONDELL. They are included.

The CHAIRMAN. There are a few questions I should like to ask you as to the meaning of some of this language: Under section 2, how far is it contemplated that the governor of a State shall proceed in the selection of a project? I see that he has something to do with approving the price.

Mr. MONDELL. As I originally wrote that provision—and I want to be very frank with you gentlemen in all the processes of this legislation—as I originally wrote that provision, the governor of a State, or agent of the governor of a State, would have the right to pass on the suitability as well as the price of lands; but after a considerable amount of discussion, and for reasons which other gentlemen can elaborate on perhaps better than I can, it was agreed—although I admit that I was not absolutely persuaded—that, perhaps, in view of all the conditions that might arise, it would be better to limit the authority of the State in the matter of the price. That is a matter which the committee, of course, must consider.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think, Mr. Chairman, that when this matter first came up there were a lot of projects in the various States, and a rush to get options, and things of that kind. There was an impression, which injured us in Congress, that it was liable to be a real estate job, and things of that kind that would tend to bring the matter into disrepute. For that reason we thought it better to obviate as far as possible any thought that Uncle Sam was liable to be swindled or that any undue rake-off or anything of that kind could be had.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that you have a particular reason for putting in the language of section 6, providing that the price fixed for each farm, tract, or lot shall represent as nearly as practicable its relative and comparative selling value. I wish you would explain that.

Mr. MONDELL. That particular language has been pawed over quite a bit. I have had some difficulty in persuading some gentlemen that that was the way to state it, and I do not know that all of those with whom I have discussed the matter are now fully in agreement with me in regard to it; but, as I explained a moment ago, in fixing

the value of a lot or farm, or of a farm worker's tract, it is necessary, first, to have in mind the total cost of the project, because our purpose is to return the total cost of the project. There are so many acres of land that must produce a certain sum, that sum being the sum total of the cost of the project. Manifestly, it would not be equitable or just or wise to lay a flat price of so much per acre on all of this land. In the first place, you will have town lots, and you will have those small workers' plats or tracts which will be near your community centers, and, therefore, quite valuable per acre. Then, there will be the farms near the center; there will be the farms on the main road, because under this bill the Secretary can build roads and it will be necessary for him to build certain roads. It will be necessary for him to lay out all the roads, and then improve such as are necessary for the early development of the projects. Therefore, a farm beautifully situated near the community center or on the main highway, would have a very much greater selling value per acre than a farm at some distance, with possibly not so good soil and possibly not quite so smooth, and in many respects less desirable.

There are plenty of men who would be quite as content to take the tracts that are not centrally located, because that land would sell at a lower price. Fortunately for us, there is a great variety of taste among men, and if we fix the price on the relative or comparative value, we shall find a purchaser for every tract, if those prices are wisely fixed. Now, as to this language, I wrote that paragraph several times before I was satisfied with it, and then I had some difficulty in persuading gentlemen that it ought to stand, and, as I said before, I do not know whether they are entirely persuaded, or not. It is the relative value as related to the cost of the whole project, and the comparative value as compared with other units of the project. Now, if any gentleman can write that provision any better, I shall be delighted to accept the language that you may agree upon. That is the best I could do.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 5 provides that preference shall be given as between applicants with a view of safeguarding the settler and the United States. I am referring to the language of section 5 in lines 21, 22, and 23. Does that mean that the Secretary may reject some applicant on account of the moral risk, or in cases where he does not consider that the applicant would make a good farmer?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. That leaves a very wide discretion in the hands of the Secretary in the selection of purchasers.

Mr. RAKER. Would it be your idea, from your experience in the West, that any man should select, as between two applicants because of their appearance or color of their hair, in giving the right to file on a homestead under this settlement act?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we start out with a preference in favor of those who have been employed in the development of these projects. Now, I think all of us will agree that that is a proper preference and, of course, there must be some preference along that line as between men who have been employed on the projects. I presume that would be exercised in favor of the man who had been there longest; or who, by his constant application, had shown the greatest interest in the enterprise; or who had been most diligent and had given the best evidence of the possession of those qualities that would

make him a happy, contented, useful, and successful member of that community. My thought was that the Secretary should grant the preference how? With a view of safeguarding the settler and the United States—they being the two parties in interest. There might be a case in which it would be as much to the disadvantage of the settler as it would be to the disadvantage of the United States to allow a man to take an obligation which, judging from his past performances, he would be unable to carry out and fulfill, and it would not be a kindness to grant him that opportunity. There would be other opportunities, possibly, involving less risk and less expenditure, which that man could avail himself of.

I think that our experience with the Reclamation Service has proved this, that, perhaps, the one serious fault is that there is no discretion vested, with the result that sometimes men acquire tracts on a shoe-string, and in the knowledge of the men who take their filing, without any real intent or purpose to establish a permanent home. If these things are to be successful they must not be speculative. The Secretary may make mistakes, and there undoubtedly will be mistakes of judgment in these matters. That is inevitable, but if we are to be successful there must be some discretion somewhere under which we can give the first preference to the man who, by his energy and application, has shown his good will and his ability.

Mr. BAER. There is one more qualification to be considered and that is experience. If the applicant is a farmer's boy and has lived on the farm for years, he would be more likely to be a successful farmer than some clerk in a store. The trouble is that they will try to get people who are clerks in stores or banks who can no more run a farm than a farmer's son can run the First National Bank of New York. They are not experienced and do not know anything about it.

Mr. RAKER. There is a thing that came up when the matter was considered originally, as to whether a preference should be given to anyone—that is, the question of whether school teachers, storekeepers, doctors, and lawyers, who may not have made any success of their business, might go in and make a success of farming.

The CHAIRMAN. The Ferris bill contains this provision: "He may by general regulations impose conditions as to the ability of the applicants so as to insure the United States and the settler as far as possible against failure." I suppose that same idea is incorporated in your bill in different words?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it contemplated by this provision that immoral or vicious persons might make application?

Mr. RAKER. The presumption is that no soldier would be that. The presumption is that the applicants will be soldiers who have been in the service.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, this legislation is definitely advanced in favor of soldiers. In view of that, do you think that the provision on page 3 that the Secretary shall, so far as possible, utilize the services of soldiers for such purposes, is sufficient to give the soldier the preference right as to employment as well as the preference right of entry? It seems to me that that language should be more specific.

Mr. MONDELL. The language "so far as possible" is about as strong as you can make it.

Mr. SMITH. I think it should be a preference.

Mr. MONDELL. It is more than a preference.

Mr. SMITH. Why not make it read, "The Secretary shall, so far as possible, give the preference."

Mr. MONDELL. I shall not quarrel with that, but that would not strengthen the provision, because when you say that "he shall, so far as possible," you put it about as strongly as you can, unless you say that no one else shall be employed. There will be conditions under which a soldier may not be available, as, for instance, for some engineering work, and there may be times when the work is going on and can not be suspended when it will be necessary to employ someone else because the soldiers may not be available. I do not see how you could make that statement any stronger, unless you absolutely prohibit him from employing anybody else.

Mr. SMITH. My suggestion was that the Secretary shall so far as he can give preference to soldiers in the matter of employment.

Mr. MONDELL. You could do that, but if you did the language would not be as strong, definite, and commanding as it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now nearly 12 o'clock, and I understand that several members of the committee desire to question Mr. Mondell further in the matter.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take any further time of the committee, unless the committee desires it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I would like to call attention to: A soldier came to me yesterday and with bated breath said that this would not amount to anything for the soldiers, because it requires him to put up one-fourth of the money for the improvements and 5 per cent of the purchase price of the land. He said that for that reason, the soldiers being penniless, this will be of no value to them. I did not agree with him, but I thought it well to call attention to it.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 28, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, May 28, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

**STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. MONDELL, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING—Resumed.**

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have with us this morning Mr. Mondell, and I believe some of the members of the committee desired to ask him further questions.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, there is one question in my mind which I have marked here, and I would like to ask Mr. Mondell about it. It is in all of the bills in practically the same language. There is one question that has occurred to me, and perhaps to some of the others, and I would like to have his idea put before the committee

as to what would be the result of it. It is on page 2 of the bill, that the Secretary is authorized, and so forth, and may withdraw, utilize, and dispose of by contract and deed public lands suitable for such purposes. I would like to have you explain that provision, Mr. Mondell, and then I want to ask you another question in regard to it.

Mr. MONDELL. My original draft of the bill did not contain that language. I do not consider it absolutely essential. I think other provisions of the bill give the Secretary the authority that is specifically given him by this language, but it may be that it is somewhat by inference, and therefore at the suggestion of a number of gentlemen, that language was inserted.

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). What language is that, Mr. Mondell?

Mr. MONDELL. The words on lines 13 and 14.

Mr. RAKER. Page two.

Mr. MONDELL. "Withdraw, utilize, and dispose of by contract and deed public lands suitable for such purposes." Now, the question of withdrawal is, of course, somewhat mooted as to the authority of the Secretary; whether the general authority granted under the act would authorize him to withdraw; whether the specific authority under the withdrawal act would authorize him to withdraw. Objection is made to utilizing the authority under the withdrawal act because of the fact that such withdrawals can only be made by the President, and it might be cumbersome and unnecessarily delay operations to secure a Presidential proclamation in all cases, and therefore I am rather persuaded that perhaps to make it entirely clear and definite that the Secretary may withdraw for these purposes, which means withdrawing possibly more than he intends to absolutely utilize, which would include withdrawal with a view to determining whether or not he would utilize the land, and in view of the fact that the authority may not exist in the general land statutes or in this bill by direct inference, it may be that that language is necessary. I personally somewhat hesitate about inserting specific authority to withdraw our lands for fear of the abuses that have sometimes arisen under authority to withdraw. Withdrawals are sometimes made without careful consideration of areas that can not be utilized, and in some cases they have interfered with other settlements and development.

In this matter, as in all others, we of course must depend upon the good judgment of the Secretary. Have you anything further under that?

Mr. RAKER. The idea in my mind, and the idea I wanted to put before the committee, was whether or not this authorization would be broad enough and extensive enough, in fact, to permit the Secretary to withdraw all the remaining public domain, if he wanted to, either temporarily or permanently.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, in order to do that, it would be necessary for the Secretary to make up his mind that he intended to utilize all the remaining public domain for this purpose. Of course, it is optional with him, but his acts must be based on the purposes and intent of this legislation, and it is to be assumed, of course, that he will not withdraw except where he has very excellent reasons or very good reasons to believe that the lands will be utilized for

this purpose, and of course, we must assume that after proper examination which we hope would be reasonably prompt, such lands as are not to be utilized will be restored. This committee it just as familiar—the older members of it, at least—with that whole situation, as I am. There is nothing I can suggest to the gentleman on my left and right, the present chairman of this committee or the former chairman of the committee in regard to withdrawals that they do not know all about, so I shall, so far as I am concerned, as an individual, be entirely content with the judgment of the committee in regard to that matter.

Mr. RAKER. The language of the bill, 415, which is like the bill of Mr. Ferris and Mr. Taylor, reads as follows, and I wanted your suggestion on it, on page 2, line 16, of the bill: "The Secretary may withdraw, utilize and in like manner with other lands acquired hereunder, dispose of portions of the public lands of the United States required to carry out the purposes of this act," and so forth.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think you would want to use the words you use there, "in like manner." I think after considering that matter you would conclude that that was not appropriate language, because you do not dispose of those lands in like manner. You dispose of them in like manner so far as the fixing of prices is concerned, but it is different between the disposition of the public domain and the disposition of the privately owned lands, and unless you change this bill, the disposition of the public domain portion of the lands utilized would be through the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. RAKER. Then it is your idea, Mr. Mondell, and I know you have given this subject a great deal of consideration, because you were at one time chairman of this committee and you have also been before the committee many times, and have given much consideration to it in the House, that this withdrawal feature unless it was abused would relate solely to lands to carry out the provisions of this act; in other words, lands to be used for soldiers under the provisions of this act, and if there was a general withdrawal it would practically be an abuse of it, and we would not expect that from any official.

Mr. MONDELL. That is my view of it; that this language could not be properly construed to justify any withdrawal except for the purpose of examination with a view to utilizing the land under this law, in which event good practice and good administration would demand an immediate return to the public domain of such lands as were not found, and found promptly, to be useful for these purposes.

Mr. RAKER. Then under this bill the withdrawal of it at any time for carrying out the purposes of the act or for examination to find out whether it was necessary or proper, would be within the power of the Secretary, and he could return it to the public domain at any time he saw fit without investigation.

Mr. MONDELL. Entirely.

Mr. RAKER. One other question. There was in the former bill considered by Mr. Taylor's committee language somewhat similar to this relative to a patent or deed. The committee after considerable consideration struck out the word deed because it is not used in the

Land Department and used the word "patent." Do you not believe, whichever way it is reported, we ought to stand on the word "patent" and not inclure or make any authorization for a deed, but stand on the law relative to "patent"?

MR. MONDELL. I am inclined to think that in this particular connection perhaps the word "patent" is preferable to the word "deed."

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell, in section 4 it is provided that dedication may be made for community centers, and then in the line below, line 15, there is the language, "Town sites suitable for the purposes of the projects may be established." I was wondering what distinction you had in mind between a community center and a town site.

MR. MONDELL. Well, this would be the procedure as it is in my mind. The first provision is that dedication may be made for schools. Now, that might be for a district school, where a dedication of an acre, or half an acre, or two acres might be made, without regard to a town site or any special center for the accommodation of the immediate neighborhood; an ordinary dedication such as we have on the public domain generally for district or local schoolhouses. Dedications for churches might in some cases be made under the same conditions for a neighborhood church; dedication might be made for a community center without the establishment of a town. In other words, a tract might be dedicated to the public for a community center adjacent to a schoolhouse or adjacent to a schoolhouse and church site. In other words, you might have a community center that was not a town; that was not laid out as a town site.

THE CHAIRMAN. A community center as distinguished from a municipal corporation?

MR. MONDELL. Yes.

MR. TILLMAN. It might be a sort of place for holding county fairs or just a schoolhouse.

MR. MONDELL. There are a variety of purposes that will occur to the minds of you gentlemen for which community centers could be used; community centers, as distinguished from towns, and that paragraph is intended to cover that situation. However, that paragraph also applies to the towns, because those dedications for community centers, for churches, and for schools, may be made in the towns. This paragraph relates entirely to dedications for public purposes, and such dedications might be in connection with a town or they might be entirely separate and apart from a town.

The next paragraph relates to the establishment of towns within which the dedications provided for in the preceding paragraph might be made.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell, have you considered the matter of yearly estimates for appropriations like we have under the reclamation law?

MR. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest right here that my recollection is that before you came in, a bill was up in the House which contained the provisions of this subdivision you refer to, and after a couple of days' debate, in which, I think, Mr. Mondell participated, it was defeated by the House, and I wondered whether they had changed their minds.

MR. MONDELL. What was that bill?

MR. RAKER. A bill to authorize the Reclamation Service to do just what is provided here, and I wondered whether we had changed our views on that, "town sites suitable for the purposes of the project may be established."

MR. MONDELL. We have such a provision in the reclamation law. I think the discussion the gentleman has in mind was a discussion as to the distribution of funds from sale of town lots. An effort was made to secure for the benefit of the towns the use of a certain portion of the proceeds of the sale of the lots, and as I recollect, by a mischance rather than by direct intent of the House, that was defeated, as I recall it, although my recollection is a little hazy. I think the gentleman from Colorado perhaps remembers about it. There was a little mix-up on it, and there was a little difference of opinion among those who were favoring it as to the terms, and in the midst of the somewhat of confusion of opinion the entire matter was lost.

MR. RAKER. May I ask this further question, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

MR. RAKER. Under this provision—and that part is new in the bill, and I would like to have your explanation of it if I may—that would authorize the complete development of a townsite, laying it out in lots and blocks and streets and thoroughly developing it just as a private individual would lay out a townsite, and then sell the lots.

MR. MONDELL. I think so. I think under that provision the Secretary of the Interior could subdivide the tract into lots. He could set aside a tract or tracts for schools and churches; he could set aside a tract for a park or community center, or whatever you may call it, or build roads. He could do whatever seemed to be wise and necessary to put that townsite in condition to make it available for those who desired to use it.

MR. RAKER. Then the balance of it could be sold for commercial purposes?

MR. BAER. I think there is one big suggestion you are overlooking in reference to these townsites and community centers which appeals to me. Elwood Mead and the different men who propose the scheme are trying to combine science with agriculture, and they are trying to devise new and efficient methods of marketing the grain, and the elevators and markets will all be in the community centers. That is one of the principles in it.

MR. MONDELL. Yes; and we discussed this paragraph, and all the others with Mr. Mead, and, I think, I discussed this matter with Mr. Mead more than any other one individual, and, I think, in the main, we have met his views.

MR. VAILE. Mr. Mondell, I notice sections 6 and 7 contemplate contracts with the soldiers, apparently reserving title in the Government for a long period of years. That would have the effect, I take it, of exempting these lands from local taxation until a patent was actually issued, as in the case of other public lands located and occupied before patent is issued.

MR. MONDELL. Will the committee allow me to interrogate the Director of the Reclamation Service in answer to your question? Mr. Davis, do any of the States attempt to tax the land on projects

where the title is still held in the hands of the Government, and do they do so?

Mr. DAVIS. There was such an attempt made but it was resisted by suit and the court held they had no right to tax the land but they could tax the improvements.

Mr. MONDELL. They could tax the improvements but not the land until the certificate had been issued?

Mr. DAVIS. Until patent was issued; yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Or the certificate which was the evidence of title?

Mr. SMITH. That does not apply to Carey Act lands.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know whether it does or not because that was not involved in the suits.

Mr. MONDELL. Carey Act lands are not Government lands.

Mr. SMITH. The title has not passed from the Government.

Mr. DAVIS. The suits did not involve Carey Act lands, and I do not know whether it would include them or not.

Mr. MONDELL. The title has passed subject to compliance with certain regulations of the State.

Mr. DAVIS. The title does not pass to the State until the law has been complied with in regard to reclamation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the practice is to tax the improvements.

Mr. MONDELL. I imagine under this bill only the improvements would be taxable while the title is in the Government. I asked Mr. Davis that question in order that we might know in regard to what had developed on the reclamation projects where similar conditions exist.

Mr. RAKER. Take the case of a large tract, say of 100,000 acres, which was in private ownership and subject to taxation, and had been taxed, and was transferred to the Government for carrying out these projects. It would not be taxed after the Government got title, and this would simply withdraw that land from taxation during the time of the work by the Government. Would that be your view, Mr. Mondell?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from California is a lawyer and I am not. I doubt if the lands could be taxed.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think our statutes out there provide that land, the title to which is in the United States, is not taxable.

Mr. MONDELL. You gentlemen who are lawyers are qualified to pass upon that question. I would not presume to offer my opinion on that question in this distinguished company. If I did I should say the land could not be taxed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Mondell, may I ask you a question or two? When this proposition first came before the Congress at the last session, I understood that the primary object of it was to furnish employment to returning soldiers.

Mr. MONDELL. Possibly that is not quite an accurate statement. The primary object is to furnish employment with a view to providing homes.

Mr. SNELL. That was one of the objects?

Mr. MONDELL. That was and is.

Mr. SNELL. From the statement you made yesterday, I took it that you thought the primary object of this was for the purpose of establishing the community idea in the rural life of the country.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no. I trust I said nothing that conveyed that idea. What I did say was this—or if I did not say it, perhaps I should say it now——

Mr. SNELL (interposing). It produced that impression upon my mind.

Mr. MONDELL. There had been many suggestions as to the way in which we could aid the soldier in securing a home on the lands. A good many people were of the opinion that all that was necessary to do was to let the soldier go out and pick out a piece of land wherever he saw fit, negotiate for its purchase and advance him the money with which to purchase it. That has been one view.

Every man who has had to do with settlement, with establishing men on farms, or supplying men with farm homes that I have talked with insist that that policy will inevitably end in failure; that it has wherever it has been tried; that to grant any man or any considerable number of men, no matter how well intentioned the majority of them may be, an opportunity to borrow practically the entire cost of an improved farm or a partly improved tract, off by himself in a community already developed, is not a kindness to the man in the majority of cases, because it will result in failure and will be disastrous from the standpoint of the promotion of a wise public purpose. These men who have had to do with such movements of development which seek to attach men to the soil, to secure homes for those of limited means on the farm, I think, practically all of them, are of the opinion that the only certain and successful way to carry on this enterprise is in settlements or communities.

Now, that means the development of the community spirit, more or less, depending upon the character of the people, their desires, and their inclinations. It means this, that everyone within a certain compact area is a settler on a land project, purchasing his land under the same conditions of obligation with regard to residence, improvement, and payment. They are combined into a community enterprise. Everyone of them in many of these communities will live on his land and on his farm just as the average American farmer does now. In some cases they may be disposed to gather somewhat into communities. That will depend upon the individuals, and will be the result of individual disposition and desire, and not grow out of any plan or purpose of the bill. However, we do think that it is essential to emphasize the community idea in this, that there is to be a community of interest, a community of obligation, a community of hope. There should be, and we hope there will be, co-operation in the communities in many lines. How far that cooperation will extend, will again depend upon the people, upon the view of the leading spirits of the community, and upon the wisdom of the men who form the community. So far as the service itself is concerned, we will begin by furnishing the people the benefits of co-operative buying of building material at least.

Mr. SNELL. Do you mean that everything will be cooperative in these communities?

Mr. MONDELL. No, sir; there is nothing in this bill that makes anything cooperative in these communities. There is nothing that requires anything cooperative in a community. In other words, we hope to do just as they are doing in California—that is, buy the

lumber, posts, and bricks, so far as they will be needed in construction, and other classes of material in quantity. Those advances to the settler for improvements will be very largely in the form of material. Now, that far you will have community cooperative buying through the Government; but what the community will do in the way of cooperation must rest entirely with the community itself. There is nothing in this bill nor in the administration of it that compels or more than suggests that sort of thing.

Mr. SNELL. You have community buying and community selling, and I thought that meant cooperative stores.

Mr. MONDELL. No; but if a community wants to establish cooperative stores, that is their affair. There is nothing in this bill requiring that. When I say "community development" I am trying to emphasize the idea of the development of a compact area, every acre of it, with no alien within the boundaries, or no one within the community who is not a part of the community. Everybody who is in that particular community is a part of it. Now, they may be just as independent in their methods of business as any American community anywhere or they may do what other American communities have tried in other places and have cooperative buying and selling and that sort of thing. That is something for them to determine. The community idea, as it is carried in this bill, from the standpoint of the statute, is the idea of developing a compact area large enough to constitute a community which will be largely independent.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell and gentlemen of the committee, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, is here; and I promised that he might go on punctually when he came. If you are willing to suspend for the time being, we shall hear the Secretary, and Mr. Mondell may resume later.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be very glad to go on further later, or if the committee does not care to hear me further I shall be entirely content.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, I wish to introduce to you the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane. We shall now be glad to hear you, Mr. Secretary.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Secretary LANE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very sorry to break in on your regular hearing, and especially upon Mr. Mondell's talk. I have nothing particular to say, except to show you my continuing interest in this proposition. Its history you perfectly well know. The reception that has been given to this proposition for the past year, because it was just a year ago that this plan was presented to the President and to Congress, shows that it has struck a popular chord. Thirty-seven out of 48 States have either passed bills furthering this plan and developing a scheme of cooperation or have appointed committees to act with the Department of the Interior in promoting it. That shows a universal desire for some such plan as this. At first it was thought to be a plan which involved particularly the interests of the West, but as the

Members of Congress and State legislatures, governors, and newspapers gave it consideration, they discovered that it was a plan that was coextensive with the country, and that it is in fact extending to the North and to the South that which you have already done for the West—that is, a method of developing unused lands. Some days ago I received from Canada a statement or report that they have had made as to the desires of the men who are returning from France to Canada.

It appears that they sent representatives to France to take a census or to make a report on the soldiers in France as to their desires with respect to taking up land, and, to my great surprise, I found that 49 per cent were reported upon their questionnaires, or about 100,000 out of the 200,000 who will return out of that force of 400,000 that they sent across, as saying that their desire is to get a piece of land for themselves and to take an agricultural course, to improve that land, and make farming their careers. We, of course, have not been able to make any such study in this country. We have sent to some of the cantonments during the winter a little pamphlet, which, no doubt, most of you have seen. It is a sort of questionnaire or catechism, and we have gotten responses from a large number of men. Up to this morning we had received 52,000 answers from men ~~who~~ expressed their desire to have one of these farms or to work on **one** of these projects. In addition to these we have received about 12,000 letters written by the boys themselves. Some of them came from France, but only to a very limited extent have we been able in any way to reach France as yet and find out what those boys there desire. These men, largely of their own initiative, and because of what they had seen in the American press, have written letters expressing their desire to be counted in.

The bill that is before you, I understand, is the Mondell bill. That is a result of a study made by Mr. Mondell of various bills that were presented at the last session of Congress. He came to me with the bill some weeks ago, saying that he had taken the Taylor bill and other bills which gentlemen had presented, and had put the provisions of those bills, with some modifications, into what he regarded as a more orderly and consistent shape. He wanted us in the Interior Department to pass upon the bill as drafted. I referred it to the Reclamation Service and to those gentlemen who are familiar with the problems involved in a large way, and they made certain suggestions by way of amendments. After that a conference was held at which representatives of the House and Senate committees were present. After full discussion Mr. Mondell introduced the bill in its present form in the House. I think that I can say without any disparagement of any of the other bills that probably the Mondell bill is one that gives expression in the most exact way, and, perhaps, as fully as may be necessary, to the desire of the department. In other words, it is the ripe fruit of a larger experience.

There is no urging that I can give to you in this matter. You appreciate that there is practically a call from the country for its passage. Some such plan is desired by the country, not simply for the sake of the men themselves, not simply to show gratitude for the service that they have rendered, and not simply as a means of staving off congestion in cities and giving employment to men who are un-

employed, but as a means for the further development of the United States. Each day it becomes more manifest to me, and I have no doubt it does to you, that a considerable portion of the support of the world for the next few years is to devolve upon us, and it behooves us to put as much of our land as we can under cultivation. Furthermore, it is manifest to everyone that the man who is the owner of a part of the soil has a new loyalty, or something that attaches him to America and to American standards, that the man who does not have that same identity of interest can not have. The American soldier ought to make an ideal farmer. The man who has been in France has had the kind of experience which ought to make him well fitted for this work.

It is my hope that as an outgrowth of this plan, it will be possible to make conditions surrounding farm life far more tolerable to our people. You can not expect that we will pass through the next few years without very considerable changes in our attitude toward all kinds of people who work with their hands, and who produce through a combination of capital, brains, and labor. One of the changes which seems to me to be most needed is a change by which the people who work upon the soil will have more of the advantages of those of us who can gather together in the cities.

I find by my talks with men who have returned from France that they have been greatly impressed with the manner in which the French farming communities carry on their life. There, as you know, the farmer lives in a village and goes out to his little farm to work. That does not seem to be the desire of our people. They wish to have the home on the land. Then there are a good many who have no desire for farms, but who have a desire for a small acreage that they can use as a garden patch to supplement the wages that they make on the outside. For that reason, in this settlement scheme we propose to have a part of it divided up into tracts of from 2 to 5 acres, upon which those who do not wish to take on the responsibilities of full farm life but are willing to work for wages can have their homes and can be to that extent independent. The plans that we have outlined to you in the past have been carried on to the extent that we could under the appropriations that were allowed us. We have practically been able to do nothing more than we had done up to the time Congress adjourned, for the reason that our money has been expended. The data that we have gathered are at your service, as well as the men who are here and who have gone out and made a survey of all sections of the country.

It is a remarkable thing to me that in parts of the United States where it was expected the least support would be given to this plan there has been a most generous and enthusiastic support. For instance, Massachusetts, which has been neglected agriculturally for a long while, is going through a period of rebirth with respect to agriculture. And so it is with many of the other States. They realize the advantage of holding their own men to them and developing their own lands near the centers of consumption, and of proving that their land which was long ago deserted by their own people really never should have been deserted, because it has capacities that never have been realized.

I have no desire to enter upon a discussion of the details of this bill that you gentlemen are very familiar with, but I simply wanted to

say a word by way of expressing the attitude of the entire country toward this measure. There was, in the first instance, some criticism, based upon the fact that it was supposed that we were to reclaim 250,000,000 or 300,000,000 acres of land out of hand, so that some of those farmers who have land of their own were afraid there would be developed something in the way of competition. But it has been made quite evident that not more than one-fifth of the demand for new land arising out of our increased population would be met by this plan.

I think that is all I have to say, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I wish to ask you what machinery or organization you have in your department to handle this scheme?

Secretary LANE. Well, of course, the primary machinery we have is the Reclamation Service, organized for the reclamation of arid lands. We have supplemented that by adding to that service engineers who have made a study of the southern and northern sections of the country east of the Mississippi River. We are not able now to go further into the question of personnel, because until we know that this bill can be passed it is not possible for us to tender anyone a position. It is necessary for us to know just as soon as possible that this measure is going through, or that it will go through, in order that we may be able to carry out the chartered organization that we have. That is to say, we have a plan of the organization already prepared, but we are not able to say to anyone what positions there will be.

The CHAIRMAN. How many replies have you received from soldiers saying that they would like to take advantage of this proposed legislation?

Secretary LANE. 52,000.

Mr. SNELL. Have you a copy of your questionnaire here?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be inserted in the record at this point.
(The matter referred to is as follows:)

(Department of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary, U. S. Reclamation Service, Arthur P. Davis, Director.)

"HEY, THERE!" DO YOU WANT A HOME ON A FARM?

If so, read this; fill in back page; tear off; mail—no postage required.

WORK AND HOMES FOR OUR FIGHTING MEN.

Q. What do you mean, work and homes?—A. Just this: Favorable action by Congress at the special session is expected on soldiers' settlement legislation, similar to that introduced and favorably reported at the recent session. If such legislation is passed it will enable the Interior Department to begin work at once developing cooperative farm settlements for soldiers and sailors in all or nearly all of the States.

Q. Who will get the farms?—A. Those who create them by working on draining, clearing, irrigating, and improving the lands.

Q. Will all get farms?—A. That depends on the amount of land reclaimed.

Q. Is this plan only for men who have been across?—A. No. It is for all of the men who have worn Uncle Sam's uniform in the Great War.

Q. Where is this land located?—A. In practically every State in the Union there are large areas of this land. There is dry land in the West that needs water, which can be provided by building dams and canals. In the East are large areas of cut-over or logged-off timber land, from which it will be neces-

sary to blow the stumps and clear off the underbrush. In the South is a large amount of cut-over land and swamp land which must be drained.

Q. Could I get a job near my old home?—A. Probably you could. These proposed settlements are scattered all over the country, and it is planned to have one in each State, if Congress provides the money for construction.

Q. How about wages?—A. You would be paid fair wages by the Government while doing this work—just as good wages as you would be able to get in outside work of like character.

Q. Would I be enlisted?—A. No. This work is only for men who have been honorably discharged from the service.

Q. What kind of work is it?—A. The Government will have work of all kinds in connection with these settlements, from the highest technical and clerical positions to that of laborer.

Q. Now, how about getting a home out of this,—A. After you have helped build the dams and canals, or cleared the cut-over land of stumps, or built the ditches to drain the swamp land; after you have helped to erect houses and barns, built fences, constructed roads, and laid out town sites, built creameries, canneries, warehouses, schools, etc.; after you have, in fact, actually reclaimed the land, the Government will allow you to pick out one of these farms planted in crops.

Q. Does the Government give me this farm for nothing?—A. No. And you wouldn't want the Government to do it. The plan is to arrange for you to pay for your farm home in small payments over a long term of years, with interest charges at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

Q. How about stock and farm implements?—A. It is planned that the Government will also furnish you with the necessary stock and farm implements, to be paid for by you in small payments spread over several years.

Q. Where will I get the money to make even these small payments?—A. You should be able to save the amount of the first payment out of your wages while working for the Government helping to build these settlements. The balance you should be able to pay from the proceeds from the sale of your crops.

Q. I think I should like farm life, but I don't like the idea of being too far away from other people.—A. It is the plan, if Congress passes the bill now pending before it, to build what are known as community settlements, each containing not less than 100 farm homes surrounding a town, so that you will have near neighbors, good roads over which to bring your produce to town, and a market for the sale of your produce within a short distance of your farm home.

Q. How many acres will my farm contain?—A. This will depend upon the location and kind of farming you engage in. For general farming from 40 to 80 acres each, live stock from 80 to 160 acres, fruit farms 15 to 20 acres, and truck from 5 to 20 acres.

Q. I don't know anything about farming, but would like to get a farm home. How will I learn to farm?—A. Competent instructors in farm practice will be stationed on each project to teach men like you just how to make a success of farming.

Q. You say that this plan depends on Congress passing this bill. Then, why are you asking me these questions now, before the bill is passed?—A. Because Congress has asked the Interior Department to make a preliminary investigation of possible settlements throughout the country, and also wishes to know whether, if construction of these settlements is authorized, the soldiers, sailors, and marines would be interested in securing work and homes on these settlements.

Q. Can I get any further information about the plan?—A. Yes. Fill out the post card on the last page of this booklet and mail it. It doesn't require any postage. Your name will then be on file in the Interior Department, so that you can be notified later if the plan is started. It is not possible now to say when this information can be sent you, and you should, of course, in the meantime not sit idly by, but instead accept the best employment that now presents itself. You are urged on your return home to get in touch with the United States Employment Service in your locality and with your local council of defense, both of which organizations will gladly give you advice and assistance in securing employment now.

Now fill out the post card on the back page and mail it. You don't have to put a stamp on it. Be sure and sign your name and write plainly. But remember that this means work. This is not a bounty scheme. It will give a chance to own a farm only to those who want to work a farm.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

UNITED STATES RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Name in full-----
 Home address-----
 How old are you?-----
 What was your occupation before you enlisted?-----
 Have you ever worked on a farm?-----
 Are you interested in this plan to provide work and a farm for you?-----

 What kind of farming do you wish to follow? State whether general, live stock,
 truck, or fruit.-----
 Would you be willing to take a job on some project if offered to you?-----
 In your own State?----- Anywhere in the United States?-----

WRITE PLAINLY AND MAIL TO-DAY—NO POSTAGE REQUIRED.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Secretary, is there any section of the country where there is an excess of rural labor at the present time?

Secretary LANE. I do not know that there is.

Mr. SNELL. What would be the effect in any section of the country, as, for instance, in central New York State, if you were to establish one of these projects? That is my State, and we have now a great shortage of farm labor. If you were to take up a large plat of ground there and establish one of these Government projects, what would be the effect of that upon the farm labor surrounding it in that State?

Secretary LANE. I do not know how it could affect that materially. We have about 1,000,000 men still left in France, and I do not know what percentage of the men in the cantonments have been demobilized, but you must realize that as an outgrowth of this bill if you were to give us this year \$125,000,000, that would take care of approximately not more than 25,000 farms; so that the drain made upon farm labor in New York could not be very great.

Mr. SNELL. I am especially interested in the condition of the farmers at the present time. I represent a purely agricultural district, and there is absolutely no help to be obtained to work on the farms. All of our people are very much interested in anything that will tend to disturb what little farm labor there is. It seems to me that if a project of this kind were established in the central part of New York State in which you would employ, say, 1,000 men, paying them \$4 or \$5 per day, the few farm laborers that we have would flock down there. Legitimate farmers could not possibly compete with that sort of market for labor and make a living.

Secretary LANE. The wages that we would pay would not meet the wages being paid for any kind of skilled labor in New York.

Mr. SNELL. I do not mean skilled labor, but I mean common farm labor.

Secretary LANE. These men would not be there in the initial stages of this enterprise in any such numbers as to be a source of embarrassment to the farmers of central New York.

Mr. SNELL. How many men would you put on a project in its initial stages, for instance?

Secretary LANE. I would suppose that if we got 4,000 men on a project that we would be doing extremely well.

Mr. SNELL. The taking of 4,000 farm laborers from central New York would absolutely cripple us with what we have there at the present time.

Secretary LANE. These men are not farm laborers, but they are men who are interested in this proposition, or men who have been everything—street car conductors, foresters, miners, etc. They are not farm laborers who have sent these requests to us. About 70 or 80 per cent of them are men who have had some agricultural experience.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that; but if you should establish one of those projects there, would not the boys in northern New York, for instance, say, "I would rather go down there and work for the Government for nice pay than to work as a common everyday farmer has to do in New York?"

Secretary LANE. I should suppose they would. I should rather think that if I were a fellow with a chance like that, and who had been across in France, I would want to get some sort of farm for myself, and that if I saw an opportunity to get that farm I would not work regularly upon a farm for wages for somebody else but would strike out for myself. I think we ought to give them that chance.

Mr. SNELL. But in doing that you would cripple the original farm industry in that section of the country.

Secretary LANE. Coming from a farming section, as you know I do, because I come from one of the great farming sections of the country, I know that at this time of the year the farmer is always busy and is always unhappy because of the prospect of shortage of labor. Last year I remember distinctly, when the war was on, how utterly hopeless the promise was that there would be a sufficient amount of farm labor to harvest the crops; and yet you in New York got your women into the fields, and they were enthusiastic about it.

Mr. RAKER. Before you get through I would like to ask a few questions, Mr. Secretary. There is a matter that has been discussed before, and one which is in the various bills, and I asked Mr. Mondell about it this morning, and I desire to ask you also, as you have given this matter from the very beginning your personal attention; in fact, I know of no man who has been more active in it than yourself.

Section 2 provides that the Secretary may withdraw, etc., public lands suitable for such purposes. I will refer only to that part of it relating to withdrawal; and the question in the minds of the committee, or some of us, is whether or not that would give a general authorization to withdraw all of the public domain or just a part which was necessary or thought advisable for the project under contemplation?

Secretary LANE. That power, of course, is rather broad, and it might be used to do injury in some of the States unless it was carefully exercised; but the intention is to withdraw only those pieces of land that are needed directly for this purpose. It is a power that has gone generally with the reclamation projects.

Mr. RAKER. While the power exists your view would be that only such lands as were considered suitable for this purpose would be withdrawn.

Secretary LANE. Yes. We will follow the general policy which we have followed regarding reclamation projects which is that only when and where we undertake the examination of a project for construction do we withdraw the land, and if found unfeasible for any reason the land is restored to the public domain.

Mr. RAKER. And even then, after an investigation is had, if a part of the land turned out to be not suitable for the project, it would be released so that it could be used for other purposes?

Secretary LANE. Yes. I can think of only one project, one large tract of land, in the whole West that we have not developed that we have withdrawn, and that is the Imperial Mesa, and that is withdrawn in the prospect of getting a canal through there.

Mr. RAKER. And while that power is in the bill you feel, as Secretary of the Interior, that the people in the West would have no fear upon that score.

Secretary LANE. I do not think there is any danger in that. I have never heard any complaint from the West upon that score regarding reclamation projects.

Mr. RAKER. I have just one other suggestion. The Members of the House will undoubtedly be asking for it, and if it is not too bulky, would it be agreeable to the committee if the Secretary would insert in the hearings the laws of the several States passed upon this homestead bill at the present time, so that we might have them in condensed form.

Secretary LANE. Very good; I will send you a copy of all the legislation and the action of all the States upon this matter.

Mr. RAKER. And may we have that inserted in the record?

Secretary LANE. It will not be long.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; without objection that will be inserted, although I think in the letter of the Secretary passing upon the bill, that is commented upon, although I do not know how extensively it is set out.

Secretary LANE. Yes; and I sent to you also a synopsis of each one of the pieces of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that will be inserted in the record together with the Secretary's report on the Mondell, Ferris, and other bills.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion in reference to that. Might we not transpose the insertion of these bills and the Secretary's report to the beginning of the hearing or has that been done?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it has not been done yet.

Mr. FERRIS. May I make that suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is a good suggestion.

Mr. FERRIS. Then those who want to delve into the Secretary's views and the action of the various States, and the laws or the bills, could have that matter come first without wading through a long hearing such as this is apt to be.

Mr. RAKER. That comports with my view, and I think it is a good suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. RAKER. I have just one other question. I do not like to take the time of the committee, but it is a matter that is in my mind

and if the committee will permit, I would like to ask the Secretary some questions as to residence. Mr. Secretary, in most of the bills the provision with reference to residence is about as follows:

The Secretary shall make regulations general in character or applicable to specific projects as to residence, etc.

Now, my question relates solely to residence. Is it not your view that there should be a specific residence of some kind by the homesteader—and I will call all these soldiers homesteaders—upon this land?

Secretary LANE. Unquestionably. That is the policy of the Congress. We do not dispose of any land unless we have a residence provided for, and we want to see that these men stay with the proposition. We are trying to make homes for these men as well as develop the land.

Mr. RAKER. This is a matter of detail, but the bill provides for patents or deeds. The bill as reported out by the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, of which Mr. Taylor was the chairman, was gone over, and the former bill, that was suggested by yourself, had the word "deed" in it. The committee struck it out because of the policy which is familiar to everybody who is familiar with patents, and you approved that substitution. I would like to ask whether or not it would be better to simply follow the practice of issuing patents and not get into the habit of granting deeds? It is only a matter of details, but I want to know your opinion on that.

Secretary LANE. I do not think the presence of both would be any embarrassment.

Mr. RAKER. It would make no material difference?

Secretary LANE. No.

Mr. FERRIS. May I interrupt to suggest that inasmuch as this bill provides for the acceptance of bequests and gifts and donations, in that event you perhaps would want to transfer by deed such deeded lands as might be given and received by gift. You would not want to go back and inject a Government patent at that stage.

Secretary LANE. No; the expectation is that those lands that are acquired shall be transferred in the same way they are acquired, namely, by deed.

Mr. FERRIS. That would necessitate the presence of that word.

Secretary LANE. We thought it would be the safe thing to put in both.

Mr. RAKER. Now, one other matter in connection with the contracts. The party would not be in a position to transfer a contract by mortgage, trust, or otherwise for 10 years. We had in one of the bills that the Government should retain its lien. Do you not believe that in some form we ought to retain that in this legislation; that where a contract is given or a patent is issued, if the whole price is not paid, the Government should retain its lien until it is disposed of?

Secretary LANE. I think it does. It can not help but retain its lien until the price is paid.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Raker, Mr. Finney has prepared an amendment on that point, and I have it here.

Mr. RAKER. Then just one other question. While the bill does not provide for it and it has not been followed very extensively in the West, and has caused a great deal of trouble in the way of abstracts

of title and keeping the records straight, and I want to ask the Secretary if he does not believe it would be a good provision to add in the bill that these matters of authorization by Congress and all contracts by the Government should be recorded in the county in which the land is situated. That would relieve us from all this trouble we have had before.

Secretary LANE. Yes, I do. I think it would be a very good thing if we could have a system by which there could be a clear run of title and have something along the line of the Torrens plan adopted, so a man would know what his property was and would be able to transfer it quickly.

Mr. RAKER. And everybody dealing with him would know about his title. There is one other question that Mr. Mondell was discussing yesterday, and I think it was discussed with you before, and you touched on it lightly this morning, and that is in regard to the community life. Your answer just given that the man should live on his place practically answers the question I intended to put; that the man should live on his place, and if he had a little tract he could go to the town. Would it be advisable for us to put in this legislation some provision whereby they could form—as they are doing and as you have so successfully maintained in the West—an organization so you would have something to deal with directly and would not have to deal with each individual man where he had filed upon land or had taken out his homestead. I don't know whether I make myself clear or not.

Secretary LANE. I think I understand you. What you have in mind is whether there should not be something analogous to a water user's association.

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Secretary LANE. Of course, we can do that now. There is nothing to prevent the formation of such an association. We want to keep our individual hold upon the man, but I think it would be wise policy to provide for the organization of cooperative associations.

Mr. RAKER. And that could be done under present legislation the same as you are doing now.

Secretary LANE. Yes; there is no need for that in the legislation at all. That is beneficial as a means of dealing with men collectively, because the idea is that all these things should be continued in the hands of the Government no longer than is necessary. The trouble with us is that we hang on to things that we ought to get rid of just as soon as there is somebody who can take hold of them and handle them effectively.

Mr. RAKER. That is what I was trying to develop.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will indulge me, I would like to ask one or two elementary questions which I think will help us in presenting this matter.

Mr. Secretary, your activity in this matter makes us all look to you more or less, and for that reason I want to hit a few high places if I may, and clear them up in your testimony.

Section 1, if you have the bill before you, as I read it and as I understand it, applies only to soldiers of the war with Germany.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And is that as it is intended?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there any doubt but what it excludes all civilians and others other than soldiers?

Secretary LANE. No. It was intended primarily to do two things, to give employment to these boys who come out of our Army now and to provide a means of their getting farms.

Mr. FERRIS. If there is any doubt as to the purport and meaning of the section other than that, it will be agreeable to you to have it amended in that way?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. What do you say as to the advisability of taking in the soldiers of any other war, for instance, the Spanish-American War, or the Veterans of the Civil War, if any there be?

Secretary LANE. I think if you start this thing and carry it on for a year, and you find that is advisable, you can do it at the end of a year better than you can now; but we ought, I think, as a national matter, and as a matter of pride, do as much for these men as other countries are doing for their men who are similarly situated.

Mr. FERRIS. And so for the present it ought to be made perfectly clear that it excludes all civilians, and on the other hand that it applies only to those soldiers who were in the war with Germany, who desire to avail themselves of it.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask you a question, Mr. Secretary? Have you given any consideration to the fact than on the border, a year before we declared war, we had nearly 50,000 men, a great many of whom did not enter the Army in the war with Germany?

Secretary LANE. Why not?

Mr. SMITH. They may have been wounded or ill, or they were not able to meet the physical requirements, or there may have been a number of reasons why they did not have an opportunity of getting into the Army during the war with Germany. It seems to me it would be very unwise to close the opportunity to those men, and I do not see where there is any argument in favor of limiting this law only to the soldiers who were in the war with Germany, when we have probably many Spanish-American War veterans who would like to have the opportunity presented to them, although they might not avail themselves of it. When you discriminate between soldiers who have served our country in any war, you are inviting opposition which seems to me to be unnecessary.

Secretary LANE. Just on that point of opposition, do you not think you will have more opposition if you make this too broad?

Mr. SMITH. No; I think not.

Secretary LANE. Suppose you take in the Mexican War soldiers, then you take in the Cuban War soldiers, and then you go back and you take in the Civil War veterans—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). They are too old to take advantage of it, and probably only a few of the Spanish-American War veterans would take advantage of it, but they should have the opportunity.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for a few minutes if Mr. Smith will excuse me and let me go ahead with a few things which I have in mind. As the bill now stands, and as it is intended, it applies to the war with Germany only; and if it does not do that, it ought to be made that way; is that your opinion?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, this bill grants an authorization of \$500,000,000. Of course, it does not appropriate \$500,000,000, but it authorizes that amount, this not being an appropriating committee. You have heard from 52,000 soldiers who have made direct reply that they would like to avail themselves of it. Of course, there are 4,000,000 soldiers in the service of one kind and another, including the Army and the Navy and all. Has anybody made a careful estimate as to what percentage of the 4,000,000 soldiers in all probability will desire to avail themselves of this law?

Secretary LANE. No one can.

Mr. FERRIS. Has any one made an estimate?

Secretary LANE. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Will you make an estimate?

Secretary LANE. No; I do not think there can be any approximation made as to the number of men who would want to go into it. You will remember that at the hearing last December, either before your committee or before the Committee on Appropriations, the doubt was expressed by some one as to the soldiers desiring to take up this kind of a proposition, and at that time we got up the little folder, which you have incorporated in your minutes, and sent it out to the cantonments along the coast here, just by way of finding out whether anybody wanted this thing or not, and the postal cards began to come in in reply, and that service has not been extended in any way. It has been purely tentative to find out whether there was any considerable proportion who wanted this thing and there is a very large proportion who do want it positively.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me see if we can arrive at it in this way: You have had 52,000 direct replies. Would there be any objection to your telling us just how many inquiries were sent out so we might estimate what percentage of them replied?

Secretary LANE. Yes; I think 250,000 of those little pamphlets were printed, and upon the basis of that figure 40,000 were returned to us. That would be 15 per cent, we will say.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us see if it would. You had 250,000 printed, or a quarter of a million, and 40,000 returned as undelivered?

Secretary LANE. No; 40,000 answers came back.

Mr. FERRIS. That would be almost one-fifth.

Secretary LANE. Not quite; about 16 per cent. Of course, there are 12,000 additional that are volunteer letters that have just come in.

Mr. FERRIS. Going on that basis, if 16 per cent made direct response out of a total queried of 250,000, then it might be a rough estimate, with some degree of accuracy, to say that 16 per cent of the entire 4,000,000 might make reply if they had an opportunity to do so.

Secretary LANE. I think that is perhaps as fair as anything you can get.

Mr. FERRIS. As a mathematical proposition that would be about 640,000. Now, Mr. Secretary, I notice from reading the bill that there is no limit or exact sum fixed which the homestead and the improvements thereon may cost; in other words, there is no maximum.

Secretary LANE. No.

Mr. FERRIS. I know it would simply be a rough estimate at best, but what would be a fair estimate as to the cost of a suitable-sized

tract, with suitable improvements, within the contemplation of this law?

Secretary LANE. We have figured about \$6,000. We will probably find that it will be a good deal more in some places and less in others.

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly that would be true, but a rough estimate of it is that the original purchase and the improvements thereon, such as we have in contemplation here, would average probably about \$6,000.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, if our other estimate had any value and this estimate had any value, it would be 640,000 soldiers multiplied by \$6,000 as the possible sum total that we might expend on this project; of course, all of us recognizing that that is a rough estimate.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, Mr. Secretary, I have been glancing through this bill hurriedly, and there are a few things here that are troubling Members of the House who have talked to me about them, and some of them have troubled me a little, and if I may, I would like to have you answer some of them. Section 8 authorizes a \$800 loan to the soldier, designated a short-time loan, and does not make any limit on the number of \$800 loans that might be made to him. Of course you have a discretion which would control that, no doubt.

Secretary LANE. That is, at no time can he have more than \$800.

Mr. FERRIS. At no time can he have more than \$800, but there is no limit as to the number of times, and I have wondered if this might not drift into something like the placer law and whether there might not be abuses of it and whether there should not be some restriction there. You can observe in section 8 just what I have in my mind.

Secretary LANE. With that proviso in, there is not a great deal of danger in the thing, and yet I do not think we ought to go into the general banking business so far as these people are concerned, except to give them a good start.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, passing from that point, if I may, a soldier who was discharged—

Secretary LANE (interposing). I do not think it was contemplated that this should be a revolving fund.

Mr. FERRIS. No; I understand not, but still they have in contemplation that this money shall be covered back into the Treasury and provision is made all the way through for that, and I think very fairly; and if not, your regulations would reach that point. A soldier who was discharged came to me the other day and he was talking to me about other things, a boy I was acquainted with, and he became greatly agitated over the fact, and said he had had a talk with some soldiers and he thought the bill might not have much value to it for the reason that you have this language on page 5, lines 16 and 17, "that no such loans shall exceed 60 per cent of the cost of the live stock and equipment purchased," and further down you require him to have 5 per cent of the sale price.

Secretary LANE. That is the initial payment.

Mr. FERRIS. You require him to start off with an initial payment of 5 per cent?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

MR. FERRIS. Now, his thought was that the soldier coming out of the service could neither furnish 40 per cent of the amount necessary to purchase the live stock he would be required to have to go forward, and neither could he furnish 5 per cent to make the initial payment. In other words, they say they come out of the service just like they came into the world—without anything—and they were fearful that even though that was intended, doubtless, to make them manifest their good faith in the proposition, his thought was that that would put it beyond the reach of the very fellows who really needed it.

SECRETARY LANE. Well, suppose the farm cost \$6,000 and you make him pay 5 per cent at first; that is, you make him pay \$300. Suppose he has worked on the project for a year at \$4 a day, he will have several times \$300 saved up if he has any gumption, and we do not want fellows who have not gumption.

MR. FERRIS. Then, suppose he needs a pair of mules, to get right down to the practical side of this live-stock proposition, which cost \$300, he would have to put up \$120 and the Government \$180, which he thought would be beyond his reach.

SECRETARY LANE. I doubt very much if that is so. You can change the percentage, of course, in any way you want, but I believe in challenging the best things in the boy and making him feel from the start that he has got to be thrifty.

MR. FERRIS. It is not necessary for me to say, Mr. Secretary, that I do not ask these questions in any captious way.

SECRETARY LANE. I understand that, of course.

MR. FERRIS. But some of us will have to go on the floor and present this matter, and I think it is just as well to have a clear understanding of it. If I may, I would like to direct your attention to section 6 for a moment, where it seems to me there is a direct conflict. Let me read the first part of that paragraph:

That sale prices shall be fixed with a view of repaying the total cost of each project, and the price fixed for each farm, tract, or lot shall represent as nearly as practicable its relative and comparative selling value.

Now, let me add that you can not have your cake and eat it too. You can not get back for the Government what it costs and at the same time sell it to him for what it is worth in all cases. They would be rare cases in which you could do that, and I am wondering if you will not have to adopt the proposition you have in connection with the Reclamation Service of getting back for the Government exactly what it costs or else make it a straight subsidy, if need be, and sell it for what it is worth; and I rather suspect the latter plan would be the more feasible one, because if the Government unduly makes these homes too expensive and too costly the soldier can not pay back what it cost the Government if it is way in excess of what the property is really worth. Would you mind giving us a word on that?

SECRETARY LANE. That suggestion there arises out of this thought: Here is a great tract of land and here is a settlement over here [indicating]. There is some of that land which is remote, and because of its distance from the central community and the distance that products have to be hauled there is less value to that proposition over there than there is to one that immediately adjoins this here [indicating].

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly.

Secretary LANE. And the idea was when we have gotten at the value of the entire tract, it would be a wise thing to put upon that land over there [indicating] a less burden than upon the 40 acres over here [indicating].

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly, Mr. Secretary; but may I interrupt to say that that is more nearly an appraisal question than it is a matter of securing the return to the Government of what it costs, or its selling value.

Secretary LANE. We wanted to put it in so that the total amount of the cost of the whole project would fall upon this single project, and each particular section would bear its particular proportion of the proper value of the whole project.

Mr. FERRIS. I think this language ought to be revised a little in order to accomplish that.

Secretary LANE. Perhaps so.

Mr. FERRIS. You could easily change that.

Secretary LANE. This says: "its relative and comparative selling value."

Mr. VAILE. We might say as nearly as practicable.

Mr. FERRIS. There is a little latitude there, it seems to me. For example, here is a soldier going on the land expecting to get a future home out of the project, and he is observing the expenditures of the Government in connection with these tracts, and if he concludes that the expenditures of the Government are going to be such as to make the farm cost more than it is really worth, you at once kill his interest in it, and he at once loses interest in it, even to the extent, perhaps, of moving off, and he will say to himself, "This is going to cost me more than I can afford to pay for it," and we have got some reason for saying that, because on some of the reclamation projects due to the lack of experience which it is necessary to acquire, we have had trouble along that line, and I was wondering if we could not perhaps correct that.

Secretary LANE. We had that question up, and I think it was made originally by Mr. Mondell, in reference to the division of the lands in the Shoshone project—that is, that there should be a difference as to the charges imposed upon the lands that were farthest removed from the main portion of the project. We did not see that it ought to be done, and it is a difficult thing to do, but I believe that machinery can be arranged by which it can be done.

Mr. FERRIS. If you invest the Government with full power to appraise and apportion the costs, and then if you were given here authority to provide that in no event should the sum exacted from the soldier who entered upon the project exceed its selling value, you would have an assurance given the soldier that he would not otherwise get.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I live right at a military fort, and they had in effect there this cost-plus 10 per cent contract plan. It might have been the best thing that could be done at that time, and probably was, but there were a good many abuses under it. I think that the soldier, in order to have this relief really secured to him, ought to be sure that at no time should he ever be compelled to pay for the project

which he had selected or which had been apportioned to him by this commission a price that would exceed what the actual value of it was. If the Government paid a little more for the land, then let that be a straight subsidy to the soldier.

Secretary LANE. I see no objection to that kind of qualification.

Mr. FERRIS. There would be some objection in the House to this on the part of those who closely scrutinize appropriations. They might say that it would make a drain on the Treasury, but for my own part I would prefer to have a drain upon the Treasury and make it certain that the soldier in taking the farm would not have to pay for it more than it was worth. Now, page 2, lines 17 to 22, provides for your commission to handle this estate. In other words, it provides, first, a representative of the governor of the State in which the lands are located; second, an appraiser designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and, next, the Secretary. By "Secretary" I presume you mean the Secretary of the Interior?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. So that you have a commission made up, first, of the Secretary of the Interior; second, some commissioner appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board; and, third, a commissioner appointed by the governor of the State. That would be the commission to handle this large undertaking.

Secretary LANE. No; that relates to the price. The bill provides that "No lands shall be acquired, however, unless the price to be paid, and the conditions under which they are to be acquired, shall be approved," etc., by this commission. That relates only to the price. That is done in order to make sure that they will get the land for as little as possible.

Mr. FERRIS. After the land is acquired the administration of it reverts to the Secretary of the Interior?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Secretary, referring to the disposition of this land after the projects have been organized and opened, is it your thought that, for instance, in the case of a project costing \$1,000,000, you would divide it up and then sell it to the soldiers for seven or eight hundred thousand dollars or \$500,000?

Mr. FERRIS. If that is all it is worth, that is exactly what I would do. This bill is rather hazy on that subject, and I think it ought to be made clear. The other theory would be that in all instances you must get from the soldier exactly what it cost. That is one plan, and some very strong friends of the Treasury would advocate that. On the other hand, the soldier is going to say that if there should be any misadministration, if there should be any extravagance, if there should be any lack of experience, or if there should be any mistakes, or if the cost should climb too high, you will be taking it out of the soldier instead of the Government. I would prefer that you take it out of the Government.

Secretary LANE. I do not think there is much danger of that condition arising. Of course, there is one possibility at the beginning of the project and that is that it often looks poorly. Take, for instance, the Minidoka project, which, when I came into office, looked badly, and yet it is as prosperous now as any part of the United States. Six years ago, if you had asked what is the selling value of this

property, it might have been said that it would not have cleared the amount put into it; but to-day you can not get that land without paying twice as much as they put in it. We have had two or three misfits, which were started under a misapprehension, but I do not know of any project that we could not sell out to-day for a great deal more than the money we put into it.

Mr. RAKER. On the other hand, suppose the Government spent \$1,000,000 on this project, which is all equipped and is ready to open. In other words, I presume it would not be opened until it is all ready with the land subdivided and classified so as to fix its relative price, and, as the Secretary said, those tracts close to the center would be more valuable than the far-away lots. Those far-away lots would be less valuable. Now, suppose you really and truly appraised and estimated the value of that project ready to open to the soldier and found that it was worth \$2,000,000. You would not want the soldier to pay the extra \$1,000,000 would you?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I would make a maximum for him, and would say that in no case shall the sum exacted from the soldier be in excess of its fair market price or value at the time he receives it. Then the soldier would be sure of what he was getting.

Mr. RAKER. You would not in any instance ask the soldier to pay more than the actual cost of the project, would you?

Mr. FERRIS. As this stands you could do it.

Secretary LANE. No; it does not do it as it stands. It provides that it shall be not more than the cost.

Mr. FERRIS. Not more than the cost, but that might be more than it was worth.

Mr. SUMMERS. In view of the fact that practically nine-tenths of the countries of the world have enacted soldiers' settlement laws requiring either that the soldier shall have been an agriculturalist or that he shall enter upon training along that line in an agricultural college or training station, or that he shall be placed with a practical farmer for training before he is assigned to one of these tracts, I would like to ask whether you contemplate anything of that kind in the administration of this act?

Secretary LANE. We do.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Secretary, I think you are familiar with the bill I introduced in regard to schools and educational work to be established in order that people may have the necessary preliminary training for their work. I am going to take that matter up with the committee and see if that system can be worked into this proposition. I think it would be impracticable to take men who are clerks in stores right now and put them on farm projects without any previous experience in farming.

Secretary LANE. I would say that the wise thing to do would be to see that each man before he got his farm had some theoretical and practical farming experience, and that can be effected to some extent while the men are upon the projects, and it can be supplemented by definite courses that will be given at particular times in agricultural schools. We have taken this up with the agricultural colleges of the country, and, if this bill had passed at the last session, it was our expectation that those boys who reported to us would take special courses in the agricultural colleges during the summer. We

have already had that matter up with the agricultural schools, but it is too late to undertake it this year, because we would have to upset their curriculums now in order to do it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Secretary, of the answers you received to the pamphlets you sent out, what percentage came from soldiers who went forth from the cities?

Secretary LANE. I should say perhaps 55 per cent. It was just about one-half.

Mr. DAVIS. Over three-fourths of them had had some agricultural experience?

Secretary LANE. That is, the boys said that they had worked on farms.

Mr. RAKER. You do not intend to enact into this legislation that a man without previous experience in farming can not go out and pull off his coat and put on farm clothes and go to work without some previous farm education?

Secretary LANE. We want to make it possible for him to get that training under this system, and we can do it with the cooperation of the State agricultural schools.

Mr. RAKER. You mean to help him in advance, but not to retard him?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. I think that nearly every other country has provided that, during the period of this training, where training is necessary, the soldier shall obtain a living wage. Is any such thing as that contemplated in this bill? That is to say, during the period of his training, whether on the farm or in an agricultural training station, practically every law, I believe, that has been enacted in other countries provides that he shall have a living wage while in training.

Secretary LANE. That has not been taken into consideration in the drafting of this bill, but in the conferences that we have had with the agriculturists and the agricultural professors and presidents throughout the country we found that it was a perfectly practical thing to give these men the kind of theoretical training that they ought to have while they are on the project itself. We have some rather distinguished instances of men with very slight practical knowledge of farming making a great success of it on some of our irrigation projects. We do not want to bar a man with good muscles and good brain, but we do want to bar the man who has no aptitude for farming.

Mr. SUMMERS. Would it not be a good idea and a practical proposition for agriculturalists to be assigned to each particular project to live with those men of limited experience, and thereby give them their training at the time that they are developing their tracts?

Secretary LANE. That is one of the plans we have thoroughly well in hand. That is in contemplation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under section 5 there is a provision that preference shall be given with a view of safeguarding the settler and the United States. I wish you would explain what will be the operation of that section.

Secretary LANE. That is a rather broad provision which has for its purpose just what I have stated, and that is that if there should

be any case where men are manifestly taking these things up in a speculative way, and not for the purpose of making themselves into real farmers, there should be some right of excluding them from the benefits of the act, and that we should have a power of rejection. That exists in Australia and in Canada.

Mr. BAER. The point I had in mind is one that our North Dakota Legislature has taken care of. Of course, these men who go into these projects do not want to get hurt after they have invested two or three years' work upon them. Suppose a man has lived for five years on a project and becomes discouraged: In that event, do you think it would be advisable to have an arrangement whereby he could recover his equities in it? That is, that he should recover the original cost, and not the increased increment. I do not mean the value of the land, but the original cost to him. Suppose he decides, for instance, that he is not fit for the land?

Secretary LANE. Of course, after a man goes on the land we would dislike extremely to eject him. I do not think that is in contemplation, and my idea was that there should be certain tests made before he went on the land. Now, you want to have the man taken care of if he does not make a success and wants to get off?

Mr. BAER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, you would place a premium upon incompetency.

Mr. BAER. I want the Government to make an arrangement covering his equities in the land, so that he will not lose all of his time.

Mr. FERRIS. May I suggest that within the first 10 years a transfer can be made with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, so that you might proceed along the line of a relinquishment proceeding and allow him to recoup his losses. After that there seems to be no limitation upon selling at all.

Mr. BAER. In our State, under the legislation recently passed, they can buy the farm, but if at any time they want to leave the farm the State takes an interest in it in trying to sell it and to see that the soldier gets the amount that he has already put into it in proportion to the original cost, and not the increased value. Now, there is another question I would like to ask: From your long and broad experience, and speaking generally, do you not think that it would be more practicable and advisable to develop some of those eastern lands near the centers of population, where they will find good markets for their produce, instead of going out and reclaiming arid lands in some of the other States?

Secretary LANE. I do.

Mr. BAER. I am very much interested in seeing the market situation taken care of. Now, if they are like they are in eastern Montana and western North Dakota—and I am not casting any reflection upon any State—the situation would be bad. Those farmers have become discouraged because they are so far away from markets, and eventually they will have to get off of those lands. They can not make good on them. If you take these men away out where you must develop railroads, the difficulties will be great. I think it would be practicable to try to fertilize these lands right here near the great industrial centers.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not a fact that the farmers on the reclaimed arid lands in the West are more prosperous than those who live in any other section of the country?

Mr. RAKER. If this bill is to stop the development of the West, it would seem to me——

Secretary LANE (interposing). Mr. Baer's point is a perfectly good one. There has got to be some artificial incentive to bring about the reestablishment of people all around upon their own lands where they have markets near at hand. You will find that sentiment very strong in States like Maine, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and all down the coast.

Mr. BAER. Now, I take it for granted that the reason they do not develop the land is because it is worn out, and it ought to be reutilized. The point is that here in Virginia and Maryland they have 56 inches of rainfall, which absolutely insures a crop, whereas in North Dakota we have 14 or 15 inches, and it is a gamble from the 1st of June to the middle of July as to whether or not we will get a crop. If we do not get rain, we do not get a crop. With the exception of the irrigation projects, I think it would be advisable for us to consider the fertilizing of eastern land in a great degree, in order to get nearer these centers of population, so as to reduce the cost of living. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. At Bridgeport and other places they are paying 58 cents per pound for round steak, and it costs only 25 cents per pound in Fargo. That is because we have cattlemen out there who slaughter the cattle right on the ground to compete with the local people. It is not so much the packers as it is the local people who charge these exorbitant prices in Washington and throughout the East. I think it is the hope of the Nation to resuscitate these eastern lands. I think that these boys in the East would as soon work in Maryland as in Colorado.

Secretary LANE. About 50 per cent of them want to go to their own home States.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the Secretary a question. Congress has been splitting hairs and microscopically looking to see whether or not some sentence in a bill could be perverted. That has been done for a year now when we ought to have been enacting this law. I wish you would give the committee, and especially the new members of the committee, a resumé of what you have stated this country is expecting to do as compared with what the other English-speaking countries are doing for their returned soldiers. I want to say this, that they are not splitting hairs over the proposition, as I hope this committee will not do. Will you give us an idea of the comparative relief or development that has been provided?

Secretary LANE. I do not know that I can give you definitely the figures.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the Secretary's report.

Secretary LANE. Canada, Australia, and New Zealand undertook legislation of this kind while the war was still on. Canada was even farsighted enough to start agricultural schools for many of the men while they were still in the trenches in France. To-day, according to a letter I received from the Secretary of the Interior in Canada, a man can get \$4,500 to apply anywhere that he wishes, provided it

has the approval of the department, upon the purchase of a piece of land, which can be supplemented by a loan of \$2,500 for the improvement of that piece of land, and he can supplement that with \$1,000 or \$1,500 in a loan for the purchase of stock and equipment. That is just an illustration of the appreciation shown by them of that situation.

MR. RAKER. Have you got that law and can you insert it in the record?

SECRETARY LANE. Yes; I think it is in the record. In England, as you know, Parliament has given consideration to this proposition, and a large amount of money is available for the purchase of leaseholds and for the building of farm houses for their people.

MR. TAYLOR. They already have these laws. They have not been quibbling around in the consideration of the bills. They already have them on their statute books and they are furnishing that relief.

SECRETARY LANE. Of course, they saw the necessity for it long before we did. There was more urgency.

MR. SUMMERS. I see that in April, 1918, France enacted legislation providing for the purchase and resale to soldiers and to civilians who had suffered as a result of the war tracts of land not to exceed \$2,500 in value, repayable in 25 years, I believe, at 1 per cent interest.

MR. TAYLOR. My thought is this, that while we are quibbling—and I think this committee does examine things microscopically—while we quibble over little things we do not get the results that the Nation expects us to get. I hope we will submerge our little individual ideas about some provision in the interest of getting results for the American people, for the development of the country, and for the relief of the returning soldiers.

MR. TILLMAN. I take it that you are not in favor of the French system of living in villages. Now, is not that preferable to the American system under which farmers live far removed from one another? Does not the French system in a large measure solve the school problem, the transportation-to-school problem, the church problem, and other social problems that we in America have suffered from for many years by reason of living so far apart?

SECRETARY LANE. It would.

MR. TILLMAN. Is it not preferable, in a modified way, to our system under which farmers live one and a half miles apart? Take, for instance, the Dakotas: The farmers up there have 640-acre farms, and they tell me that many of the farm women go insane because they have no means of associating with their neighbors. Many of the girls go to the towns because of the lack of social advantages. I visited a French settlement last year, and I rather liked it as compared with our system of living in remote places and far apart.

SECRETARY LANE. I sought to find out somewhat about that by having one or two of our men meet men in the cantonments and talk with them about that, and the idea is very strong in their minds that the home should be upon the land, but we want to get a compromise between the French village and the isolated farm by which these lands are all laid out with reference to a central community, so that the people will be gathered closely together and connected up with good roads and telephones, and be near the schools. I think we can get the primary advantages of the French system, and at the same

time obtain all the best advantages of the American system of farm houses.

Mr. RAKER. Just what particular feature of the French system would you adopt?

Secretary LANE. I would take simply the central settlement, with its school, its church, its garage, its bank, and post office. Then I would have these farms to radiate out from them, so that they would be brought close together. Then I would have all the community activities centered in that central place.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought you were opposed to that. You say that some of the boys coming from abroad did not like the French system.

Secretary LANE. They do not like it in so far as it meant the homes in the village away from the land.

Mr. VAILE. How many French farmers own flivvers?

Secretary LANE. We own in this country 5,000,000 automobiles, which is more than is owned in all of the rest of the world put together.

Mr. VAILE. That fact alone makes a great difference in considering the advisability of adopting the French system, does it not?

Secretary LANE. Yes; but they ought to be near together for the sake of the women and primarily for the sake of the children.

Mr. RAKER. Each French town centers around a main street which runs right up and down. Each man has his home and his barn in the same house, and he has his pigpen, chicken pen, and manure pile in the front yard right on the main street. That is a typical French town or center. In Italy, this has been in operation for 2,000 years, and they are living in tents or wickie-ups like the Indians are living today in California. I hope that this country will never get into that situation.

Mr. FERRIS. I would like to ask one more question: Should there not be a value placed upon the homestead unit with some latitude going above and below, or should there not be some limitation on the amount that should go for an individual homestead?

Secretary LANE. Do you mean a maximum amount inserted in the bill?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir; either that way or some other way. For instance, have a homestead at \$5,000 or \$2,500, with a proviso that the Secretary may in some cases go beyond that by a certain percentage. In other words, as the bill now stands, there is no minimum or maximum, or exact basis in dollars and cents for one of these homesteads. I think the bill will be subject to some criticism on the floor without that, and it will probably make it hard to get it through if we can not arrive at some estimate of what it will cost.

Secretary LANE. I think the wise thing would be to make a maximum estimate going pretty high, but possibly you would have as much criticism of that on the theory that by Government development you would make them all maximum farms.

Mr. FERRIS. There is something in that. Still, as the bill now stands, there is no maximum and no minimum for these individual allotments.

Secretary LANE. That is a matter of judgment with this committee as to whether it is advisable to have that in so as to get it through. So far as we are concerned, we will try to make the farm one that will support a family. We will not want to extend it any more than is necessary.

Mr. FERRIS. Should there not be a minimum and maximum acreage as well as a minimum and maximum price?

Secretary LANE. No; because we have no trouble on that score under the reclamation projects, except where we have made a minimum that they thought ought to be a great deal smaller than it ought to be.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, different jurisdictions would require a different acreage and a different value as between, say, 600 and 640 acres, or \$2,000 and \$5,000.

Secretary LANE. There would be no objection to that at all if there was any such latitude.

Mr. BAER. I think it would be perfectly impracticable to have a maximum average individually, but you could have a maximum average for the whole project. One farm might cost \$10,000 to improve it, but it might not be any better than a farm that cost \$2,000.

Secretary LANE. I understand that that is Mr. Ferris's idea, that there should be an average on the project, but not on the individual piece.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 29, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 29, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

**STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. MONDELL, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING—Resumed.**

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell will resume his statement which was interrupted yesterday.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of the committee further, but am at the service of the committee to answer any questions the members desire to ask. Preliminary to that, there is just one point that has been referred to, I understand, which perhaps it might be well to discuss for just a moment.

A query has been raised as to the effect of legislation of this character upon farm labor, its demand and supply. This is a country of 100,000,000 people. Just how many folks there are engaged as employees or laborers on farms, I do not know, but, in the first place, the provisions of this act, helpful as we hope they will be; the operations under the act, extensive as they will be; and large as will be the number of people to whom it will give employment, can not in the nature of things, in a country so large as ours, with so enormous a population, a large portion of which is engaged in agriculture, have a very considerable effect one way or the other on the supply and demand for agricultural labor.

If it has any material effect in that direction, it will be to encourage men to seek employment on farms, because the discussion of a program of this kind, as a national policy, the fact of the Government's embarking on such an enterprise will tend to turn men's minds to-

ward farming and farm homes and be helpful in inclining men to seek farm employment; not necessarily on these farms, but on farms everywhere. You can not discuss a matter of this kind extensively, widely, and generally, as it will be discussed, partly through the influence of this proposed legislation, in a country like ours, without the effect of turning men's minds and inclination toward that kind of enterprise, and that form of employment. So that whatever effect it may have, it will tend at least to increase the supply of men and the number of men inclined to seek employment on the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell, we could hardly afford to take the position that by withholding necessary legislation, this committee would be willing to sentence these soldiers who formerly were farm laborers to a life as a farm laborer. Do you catch that point?

MR. MONDELL. I do not think I would state it just as the chairman does, because I do not think that would be a sentence in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word. The happiest days I can remember, and I think the healthiest, were the days when I stood between the handles of a plow.

MR. SNELL. But you wanted to get away from it?

MR. MONDELL. I can not remember any greater joy in my life than my days on a farm or ranch.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not want to follow it all your days?

MR. MONDELL. I can not remember a minute of my life as perfect in content as when, behind a good team and a good, well-polished plow, I was engaged in turning the stubble. It is the height of content and satisfaction. You do not sentence anybody when you incline them or urge them to that kind of employment. The next best thing to owning a farm is to work on one.

MR. TAYLOR. Mr. Mondell, I think the thought of the chairman is that you do not want to do anything to take away the hope of one of those men of owning that farm himself and owning that team himself.

MR. MONDELL. Yes. Now, getting to the chairman's thought, it is that it has been suggested that through this legislation we might hold out a hope to a man who has been working on a farm and who might, other than for this legislation, continue to work on that farm, that through this legislation his farm work might ripen into farm ownership and therefore take as a laborer from the farm. Even though that might be true, it should not, of course, deter us from the enactment of the legislation, because it would be a most excellent thing. We would hope, of course, that if through this legislation a farmer might lose a farm hand, that the hope we are holding out—the encouragement we are giving to farm work and farm ownership—would raise up another farm helper to take the place of that man, and I think it would. Wherever you might take a man away from labor on farms now developed through legislation of this kind, I think through the effect of the legislation, direct and indirect, and the discussion under it, you would incline the minds of two men or more toward taking up farm work.

Certainly there is nothing that we can do that would be more useful and helpful to the country than that, because the more men we can get away from the bright lights, and the artificial conditions of town life, tremendously attractive as they are in these days, back to the soil, to the healthy conditions of life close to nature, and on

the soil, the better it is going to be for the country. Every nation that has ever prospered has been compelled to make it a part of its purpose to legislate along lines that will tend to incline men to farm work and employment and farm owning.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Mondell, in that connection, may I ask you a few questions at this time. I listened with a good deal of interest to your description of the farm boy's life. I suppose most of us have been there ourselves. Of course, that is more of an expression than a fact, and I suppose many of us have done the same thing, but while we are walking between plow handles and while an uncle who had not any relatives or any one else to leave his property to said, "Here, John, if you will stay with me this is all yours when I pass away," but, nevertheless, the boy keeps thinking as he walks between those plow handles and other things that he would like to branch out a little for himself.

Mr. ELSTON. And be a Congressman.

Mr. RAKER. And do a few other things that other people have done and advance himself.

Mr. MONDELL. I think I would still be between the plow handles if it had not been for some very unusual droughts and a long siege of grasshopper devastation.

Mr. RAKER. The only way I got away from between the plow handles, notwithstanding the objection of my uncle, was to save my money and raise a few cattle and horses, and go to school, notwithstanding the promise of a gift of two farms if I had stayed. Maybe I would have been better off if I had stayed on the farm. Now, that same thing is found right here in this bill, and I want your best judgment on it and also the judgment of the committee. It is in section 7, page 4, where you tie the man down forever to this farm, and it is a change in every principle that we have had as Americans in the disposition of property.

It first provides that no contract, transfer, or assignment or mortgage or lease shall be made within 10 years without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ELSTON. On what page is that?

Mr. RAKER. Page 4 of the Mondell bill, section 7, and then follows this language, "No transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary."

Is it the purpose of this language to prevent the man, after he gets his certificate of purchase, or makes his payments whereby he gets a patent, from being in position to sell his property freely and voluntarily?

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Raker, will you permit me to call Mr. Mondell's attention to that language and to a thought which has occurred to me? That paragraph, beginning at the bottom of page 4, is an absolute prohibition upon a transfer at any time, and the first paragraph seems to indicate that he may transfer it after the 10-year period. There is a prohibition for a period of 10 years, and afterwards a prohibition for all time without the consent of the Secretary. I did not know whether there was any inconsistency there or not.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, I do not think the language is inconsistent, although the members of the committee

must judge of that. The first provision is one that prevents a transfer within 10 years of the original sale of the property without regard to whether or not, in the meantime, the Government obligation has been fully met, without the consent of the Secretary. That is the first proposition. For the first 10 years, even though the Government may have been fully reimbursed, may have issued its patent or its deed, there can not be a transfer without the consent of the Secretary. The purpose of that is to carry out the intent of the act to give all the benefit of this enterprise to the soldier purchaser. More than that, to strongly persuade the soldier purchaser to be the sole beneficiary for 10 years of the increasing values. Now, anyone who knows about development of this kind knows that conditions of this kind will likely arise—they have arisen on our reclamation projects: An enterprise is unusually successful, property values rise rapidly, particularly in favored locations, and there is a temptation, particularly to the man who has never possessed very much, to the man of a wandering spirit, to the man who possibly has not had instilled into his soul the necessity, or, at least, the importance, of having a home, to realize on a slight increase or considerable increase, as it may be, in the value of that property, and if the enterprises are successful, no end of folks are going to be hovering about to take advantage of it.

It might be in one case that the offer was only a few hundred dollars above the Government obligation; it might be several thousand dollars above the obligation, and an individual whom we have no purpose in aiding under this bill, a person whom we are under no obligation to aid but who happens to be the fortunate possessor of some cash, might step in, taking advantage of the temporary discouragement of a settler, taking advantage of his desire to seek other fields or to realize in hard cash a small sum, and buy his property.

It is a new provision under our law in the transfer of property. This whole proposal is new. We are embarking on a new sort of enterprise. There is a certain class of men we want to give an opportunity, and we want to encourage and defend them in securing all the benefits of our action.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Mondell—

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). One moment, please, let me finish what I have in mind, because I think this is very important, and whatever the committee does in regard to this and to all these other things. The committee will have no quarrel with me about it. What we have sought to do is to give our soldiers the benefits of these enterprises and the benefit of the unearned increment, if that is a proper word in this connection, that may arise out of this development.

Mr. SNELL. Do you think these boys would be willing to tie themselves up definitely for a period of 10 years?

Mr. MONDELL. They would not tie themselves up absolutely. A transfer may be made at any time with the approval of the Secretary, which means with the approval of such board as the Secretary will establish, whose business it will be to study the situation. No such body of men are likely to deny a man the right to transfer his property when any conditions arise that make it important from his viewpoint and from the viewpoint of his welfare to transfer it. Conditions may arise under which it is essential that a man may be

given the opportunity to sell. Those conditions may be established, and there will be men on the ground who will be familiar with the situation and who will understand the conditions, and I am of the opinion that there will be no serious cause for complaint under such management as we hope and confidently expect to have under a law like this. Now, you must either do that or you must admit that we look forward and anticipate that where one of these enterprises is really successful in a very short time the men who are the beneficiaries of it will not be the soldiers at all, but will be those who are fortunate enough to have enough money to pay off the Government obligation for the soldier, get his patent or deed, pay him a trifling sum—and in many cases it will be a trifling sum—over and above the Government's charge and secure the property.

Now, another thing, without going too far into the matter of regulation, we want, if possible, to prevent the consolidation of these areas into large tracts. I know it is not necessary that I should go into a discussion of the importance of retaining, as far as we can in reason, land ownership in areas necessary for the support of a family rather than the gathering of lands into large ownerships leading inevitably to tenantry, and we certainly do not want to put the Government's money, ostensibly for the benefit of the soldiers, into an enterprise of this kind, and then discover in a few years that men have been persuaded to part with their property, the lands have been consolidated, and that a few men own the choice tracts on one of these projects.

MR. RAKER. You have given but one side of the matter and that is on the assumption of protecting the soldier, but you must remember now the experience of the last 10 years of people under the reclamation service who clamored and came to Congress, and Congress enacted legislation coming from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands—and I had the pleasure of helping to write that particular law after many conferences whereby a man was permitted to have his patent before he made his payment.

Otherwise he never could sell his land until the final payments were made, which might be 1 year or 5 years, or 10 years or 15 years or 20 years, and we authorized a patent to be issued and retained a lien by the Government to the end that he might sell it whenever he saw fit. They all clamored for that legislation, and do you not think we ought to permit something like that in this legislation?

MR. MONDELL. I can not agree with the judge that they all clamored for that legislation. A certain number of men clamored for it. I expressed some doubt as to the wisdom of that legislation. I have doubts now of the wisdom of it. I think it has resulted on some of the reclamation projects in more transfers than are for the good of the original owner. I know of one project where there has been quite a number of transfers of the choicest part of the project. I believe it would have been in the interest of some of those who disposed of their lands if they had not been in a position to dispose of them so easily and so readily.

Under the reclamation law anyone can come and buy and sell and there is no discretion. There is a discretion here. We are trying to aid a certain class of men. We are not only putting land

in condition where it can be farmed, but we are proposing to aid in building homes, houses, and barns, and to lend money to buy the first cow and the first team and the first flock of chickens.

MR. BARBOUR. May I interrupt there, Mr. Mondell, because that is touching right on the proposition which has occurred to me in reading this bill, and one that Mr. Ferris has touched on once or twice here? The provisions are that the Government will lend to the soldier as high as \$1,200 for the erection and improvement of buildings, but not more than 75 per cent of his investment for improvement. That would contemplate a minimum for improvements, upon which the Government would lend 75 per cent. Now, in the West, where many of these projects will be carried on, and I presume the same conditions exist in the East to a more or less extent, \$1,600 is not going to give a man a whole lot of improvements; but on his improvements alone he must have \$400 before the Government will lend him the \$1,200.

Now, on his live stock and equipment the Government will lend him up to \$800; that is the maximum that the Government will lend him, and that is 60 per cent, and if he uses his maximum he must have somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,350 for live stock and equipment, which is not a large amount for live stock and equipment. In other words, before he can borrow up to \$800, he must have \$500 of his own money. Now, I understood Secretary Lane to say yesterday that the land value of each of these allotments would be about \$6,000. He must also have 5 per cent of that amount, which would be \$300. If he goes in and erects \$1,600 worth of improvements, which is not a large amount for this purpose, and if he also buys \$1,350 worth of live stock and equipment and pays his initial 5 per cent payment, he must have in the neighborhood of \$1,250 to make his start. Mr. Ferris touched on that subject yesterday when Secretary Lane was here, and Secretary Lane said that if the soldier worked on this project for a year, and had any gumption—I believe that was the word he used—he would have saved enough money to make his initial payment. Now, assuming that the soldier is paid \$4 a day for his labor, which I believe would be a liberal payment, and he works 300 working days in the year, he would only have made during that year in all \$1,200; whereas, in order to make his entry on this land he must have \$1,250. Now, does not that go to the very workability of this project? Is it not requiring a little bit too much of the soldier; and I would also like to ask, in connection with that, how that compares in liberality with the provisions which the Canadian Government is making for its soldiers? Of course, I am asking these questions simply for information.

MR. MONDELL. The question raised by the interrogatory of the gentleman from California is primary. What is it that we are proposing to do? Are we proposing a bounty; are we proposing a gift; are we proposing a gratuity, or are we proposing helpful aid? The thought underlying this bill was that of helpful aid, and in granting that helpful aid there must be certain safeguards provided. The matter must be considered by starting out with the proposition that we are going to give real and effective helpful aid to the soldier; that we are going to do it in a very practical way; that we are not going to lead him up any blind alleys; that we are not going to

promise him gratuities or make him presents. We hope to offer a plan which will appeal to those who really desire a home and who are willing to make the effort that is required and always will be required anywhere on earth to get one. We have not overlooked the soldier, John Smith, who enters upon one of these enterprises without a penny. The average time required for the construction of one of these enterprises before the farms are ready or opened will not be less than two years. I think that in the majority of cases, where the work to be done is so extensive that the price will be considerable, it will be nearer three years than two years before the farms will be ready.

Where the farms are ready more quickly than that, they will be in regions where the work to be done is of such a character that the cost will not be high. The Secretary has fixed \$6,000 as the average cost of a farm, but in my thought on the bill I have had \$5,000 in mind as the average, although it may run to \$6,000. Let us bear in mind that there is also a provision under which a man can get a home on a small tract which will cost very much less than that, but we are speaking now of farms. John Smith begins at the beginning of the project, and, as suggested, at a wage of perhaps \$4 per day. That will certainly be a very good wage, because we must remember that whatever the wage is, it must be eventually paid by these farmers, and therefore the wage should be fixed in view of the going wage, in view of the cost of living, and in view also of the fact that the man who receives it is the man who eventually must pay it. Within two years a man can certainly save on \$4 per day, or even less, \$250 or \$300 if he has in prospect a home. If he is not inclined to do it, I doubt if he has the stuff in him to make a home. If a man is really in earnest about this thing, certainly he can save \$1 per day out of a fair wage and in two years would amount to \$600.

Now, the initial payment of 5 per cent, which must be made in cash, would amount to \$250 on the average, or to \$300 at the outside. So that John Smith, starting without a cent, working on that project, and having no friends from whom he can make a small loan, and having no property anywhere on which he can realize a penny—and that is the unusual case, because almost every man has some little resources—but, assuming that he has nothing, and that he works 18 months to 2 years and saves reasonably—and he would not have to sacrifice to do that—he would have at the end of 18 months or 2 years more than enough money to make the initial payment of 5 per cent on one of these tracts, which would amount to from \$200 to \$300, depending upon the size of the tract. It would not be more than \$25 or \$30 on one of the small farm worker's tracts.

We then come to the buildings, which mean the house, a shed barn, and fencing. John Jones has bought his farm and is upon it; if John is the right kind of a fellow, he can contribute labor in the digging of the postholes, in the setting of the fence posts, and the stringing of the wire. If he has even average skill, he can help to build the shed barn and help to construct, at least, the foundation of his house. If he is fairly skillful, he can help in the building of his house to meet his 20 per cent of the improvement payments. I think that it will be entirely possible in many localities to make the initial improvements for less than \$1,600. Many a farmer has started and been very suc-

cessful with buildings that cost less than that at the beginning. If this man and his wife have a house of two rooms, that will do for a few months at the start. We are not expecting these soldiers to go through with what most American pioneers have gone through in the beginning, but they can start modestly.

Mr. SMITH. I would like to suggest something that might be helpful to you: On the Twin Falls project, which is the most prosperous irrigation project in the West, there are hundreds of those farmers who are living with their wives in one room, and they have been doing that for more than a year.

Mr. MONDELL. I began as a pioneer on a homestead in northwestern Iowa, and I have seen homesteaders in every western State and Territory in the Union. I have seen hundreds and thousands of homesteaders in one-room sod houses that did not cost over ten or twenty dollars beyond what the man put in by his own labor. We are not expecting that these men shall start life in that way. We do not want them to. But I remember very well starting as a preemption settler on a tract in northwestern Nebraska in a house that was part sod and part frame house, and, I think, cost about \$50 besides labor. And it was a comfortable house. In the first place, it will not necessarily cost \$1,600 for the average man who has anything to start with. If he is a man with a family, he probably can borrow a few dollars from his wife's folks; or if he has the right kind of wife, she will help greatly. They do not have to have a fashionable bungalow at the start.

I assume plans will be prepared by the service, a variety of plans covering all sorts of houses and barns, from a one or two room emergency home to the very fair bungalow farm homes. The men will have the benefit of these plans and of the specifications as to the lumber required, and they will have the benefit of wholesale buying of the material. Now, a man wants a house and barn that will cost, perhaps, \$1,000 or \$1,200. He does not want to borrow more than six, seven, or eight hundred dollars, but he contracts himself to build that house according to those specifications for the sum that the Government advances, and the balance of the cost he pays in his own labor. Speaking about houses, I spent a night about a year ago in one of the temporary structures that the Reclamation Service builds for its engineers in charge of projects. The man and his wife and two small children were living in three rooms. Of course, they were not so big, but there were three rooms, a kitchen, dining room, sitting room, parlor, and bedroom combination. It was a perfectly comfortable place for that little family for the time. He was an engineer and expected to occupy it for two or three years while they were developing that project, and they told me that by buying the stuff wholesale the house cost \$500.

Now, I do not claim, and no one who has had to do with the drafting of this bill claims, that there is anything sacred in these figures or in these percentages. It would be foolish to have any such idea as that, because that is only the opinion of a few men who had to do with these things, and I have taken their judgment very largely to work out a practical scheme that was within the reach of any man who was ambitious to have a home and who was willing to work for it. We were careful not to hold out hopes to the man who

simply wanted to realize on increasing values and who had no thought of establishing himself on the soil and working for a home. Therefore, you may modify those provisions as you see fit, but those were the percentages and those were the sums that we arrived at after consultation with Mr. Mead and representatives of the Reclamation Service who have some knowledge of the cost of temporary buildings, and gentlemen who have had to do with that sort of settlement improvements.

Now, let us come to the third proposition. During the time that John Smith is purchasing his buildings or putting up his buildings there will be more or less trading in calves, chickens, and horses that are serviceable for farm work, but possibly not of the highest price in the country. There will be a bit of trading about among the folks and that sort of thing. Out of savings they will gather in a few chickens, a pig or two, a calf, or an old horse.

I do not think that any fellow who is going to make a success of it will have any difficulty in matching the Government's advance to him for live stock and machinery on the basis of 60 per cent to 40 per cent. However, there is nothing sacred about those percentages. The thought was that when we got beyond the line where we gave the man an opportunity to buy a farm on very long-time payments and a low rate of interest, and then provided a plan for the erection of his building under which his own work would contribute in one way or another his share of that improvement, if he was the right sort of a man he would be able when he came forward for the live-stock and machinery loan to show a certain amount of stock which would make up his percentage of the aggregate value of the property on which the Government could be secured for its loan.

Mr. ELSTON. Some of the projects would be on the cooperative basis, would they not, Mr. Mondell? The community or project might have so much live stock to do the heavy work. Is it contemplated under this measure that they may do work in common on these projects?

Mr. MONDELL. Undoubtedly the community could arrange for cooperative work in that direction. Remember, where it is essential the department can go forward under this law, not only to prepare a part of the farm for cultivation, but they may even plant the crop on a small acreage if the seeding season comes along just before the sale, and it seems advisable to have the seeding done in April or May for the man who is going to buy in June or July. That has been the practice frequently. While this bill does not specifically provide for that it undoubtedly would authorize its being done. Now, if the committee feels that the bill is not sufficiently liberal, of course it must exercise its best judgment in that regard. We have done the best we could.

Mr. NICHOLS. Following up the thought presented and the figures offered by Mr. Barbour, are many of these farms to be located in the Middle West or East?

Mr. MONDELL. Would you allow me in answering that question to say, first, that Mr. Barbour's question was based upon the assumption that the man in every case was going to demand the maximum and was going to get it, but, of course, Mr. Barbour did not assume in asking this question that every man in every case would have to

meet his percentages of that maximum in cash. He was asking the question, as it will be presented by men who want to know how it will work out. What I have been trying to point out is the fact that other than the original 5 per cent, which must be in cash, there is not another obligation that the man must meet that can not be met wholly through his own labor or through the means that he can accumulate at odd times or odd hours by his own labor.

Mr. NICHOLS. I understand you to say that a man in the South would be able to save \$1 per day for 300 days in the year. I want to ask you whether in the Middle West and in the East, where some of these projects will be located, a man will be able to work 300 days in the year? Would not the weather conditions in winter make a difference there?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course there will be the winter season, and in some cases men will not be able to work all the year. Men who have a home ahead of them, who have the hope of a home, and the expectation or determination of getting one, will not have any trouble in meeting the conditions of this bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. I did not ask my question with an idea of criticizing this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that. You wanted to bring up that feature of it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I wanted your view upon it, because I knew you had gone into the matter fully, and because that would be one of the first questions asked by anyone interested in one of these projects. One of the first questions that he would ask would be what financial ability would be required, and I would like to be in a position to answer that question.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that I have answered it adequately.

Mr. ELSTON. With regard to section 7 of the bill, in that section you provide against assignments, but you have made no provision here in case of the death of the settler or his disability. How would that be cared for? Would it pass to his heirs without any particular action, or, in case of permanent disability during the time he was performing the obligations of the contract, what would happen to him.

Mr. MONDELL. The question that arises in my mind in reference to qualifying this discretion on the part of the Secretary is that it would be difficult to find an end to suggested qualifications of his discretion. I assumed, and, of course, we must all assume, that in carrying out a law of this kind, good judgment, a humanitarian view, and kindly purposes will rule. I should not think it conceivable that the Secretary would withhold the right of transfer in the case of death or permanent disability, or in other case where there were like hard conditions.

Mr. ELSTON. There might be conditions under which the property might have to be sold at a sacrifice. I do not know whether the language giving the authority to sell is inclusive enough to permit him to act in a case of that kind.

Mr. MONDELL. As a matter of fact, under language of this kind, the Secretary can say to everybody, "You can sell when you get ready or whenever you desire to sell." He can not sell without the authority of the Secretary, but the Secretary can grant that authority

just as broadly as he wants to. There is no question about the Secretary's authority. There may be some question as to whether the Secretary would in all cases exercise his discretion wisely, and would allow a man to transfer in a case where he had presented considerations and conditions that would justify a transfer. It might be in some cases difficult to persuade the Secretary as to the propriety or wisdom or necessity of making a transfer. Now, there is one more thought on that point: This very thing would be quite helpful to the man who wanted to sell in guarding him against people who might want to take advantage of his necessities by buying him out at a very small advance over what he had paid. The man who will primarily pass upon a question of this kind will be the man in charge of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there I want to call your attention to what Mr. Mead said on that same point in his summary. He gives a summary of the various laws in the English-speaking countries, and he states that in nearly all the acts, while the soldier is not legally required to maintain a residence, he can not lease his land or transfer it within a stated period. That is in line with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. Now, just to finish the thought I had in mind: A man might be approached when he was in a condition demanding the possession of some cash and be tempted to sell. Not being inclined to disclose that condition to his curious neighbors, he might be disposed to sell. I can readily understand how under those circumstances the right kind of man in charge of a project might be of some assistance to him in pointing out ways of relief or in suggesting that if he must sell and if the conditions were such as to warrant his selling, he ought to get a better price than the offer that is made to him. He might assist the settler in that way very materially.

Mr. SMITH. What would you think of the proposition of limiting these transfers to soldiers, so as to carry out your suggestion that only soldiers should be on these projects?

Mr. MONDELL. That, of course, is a thought that is worthy of consideration. That is the situation in the reclamation projects; that is, before a man has secured a limited patent by completing his term of residence, he can only transfer it to a man who is eligible under the law, or, in other words, to one who is himself eligible as a homesteader. I think that thought is worthy of consideration. I think it is tremendously important that you should so guard this as to protect the men. It is for the protection of the men in the first place, and it is for the protection of the community in the second place, in order to prevent men who are not entitled to the benefits of this development from securing them, and to prevent the consolidation of lands into large areas. That is tremendously important.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you a question in reference to the language in section 7, at the bottom of page 4, beginning with the language, "No transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease made during that period shall be valid without the approval of the Secretary, and no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary." Now, that is absolute, and it seems to me that it is covered by the first part of the section. Why is it necessary to have both of those clauses?

Mr. MONDELL. Because the first prohibits the transfer even after the issuance of a deed. The second is that no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary. They are two entirely different things. First, we are preventing the transfer of these lands without approval, even though all of the Government obligations shall be met, and the patent or deed shall be issued within 10 years.

That first provision would have to be written in the patent or deed in order to make it effective; the second applies to the contract of sale, and, of course, it would be a part of the contract of sale. You can not very well combine those two things in the same statement.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to ask whether this bill makes provision for a shortage of crops or a failure of crops, which might easily occur and occasion loss to the soldiers, thus threatening them with a shortage of funds with which to go ahead with the next year's crops, all through no fault of their own, but because of a real shortage of crops in that section of the country? It seems to me that a man who was working on one of these schemes and who had gotten Government advances, should be provided for in case there was a shortage of crops and he needed money for the continuation of the next year's crops, or, possibly, there might be a shortage in two crops.

Mr. MONDELL. Your thought is that there should be some provision under which certain conditions a man might not be required to meet his payments?

Mr. HERSMAN. And have further advances that it seems are provided for in this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, as we go along with the development of an enterprise like this we will see things that perhaps we ought to do; but meeting your last suggestion first there is a provision in the bill under which the Secretary, under regulations, fixes the conditions of payment. I do not think it is wise to attempt to outline or to limit the Secretary's discretion in that regard. You could easily say that upon the failure of crops the man would not have to pay, etc.; and then you would immediately have the question raised ten thousand times as to what constituted a failure of crops. I think that is a field which you must leave to the discretion of the Secretary. Let me say this with regard to the Reclamation Service. We have had some experience there. There is a very drastic provision under the reclamation law under which a man can be absolutely closed out, receiving nothing for his payments. There is no such provision in this bill, and even under that drastic provision the discretion is such that there has been no complaint up to this time which has reached my ears of a man having been closed out on a reclamation project, and we have 24 of them in 17 different States.

Now, that being true, under a provision which gives the Secretary the clear authority, and in a way makes it his duty to compel payments, the matter of security and the matter of discretion under certain circumstances is left to the Secretary. I do not believe it would be wise to attempt to write into the law any language that would have the purpose of guiding that discretion, because writing in one condition under which the Secretary is advised, or it is suggested that he shall grant extensions, excludes other conditions which might arise that we did not happen to think of.

Mr. HERSMAN. My idea or thought was to give the Secretary a larger discretion in advancing the money or to give him a further discretion.

Mr. MONDELL. All the limit we have placed on him is that he can not advance over \$800. He does not have to advance that all at one time. He can advance it at several times, and that has been one criticism of the bill—criticizing it from the other direction.

Mr. HERSMAN. Does he not have to take a mortgage on live stock for the \$800?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. Suppose the man has live stock but has not facilities for going ahead in other ways? He may not have enough money to buy his food.

Mr. MONDELL. We have tried to be businesslike, and yet not impose a condition that energetic, well-intentioned men can not meet. Of course, in the carrying out of a project of this kind, there will be innumerable questions of discretion, and the discretion is here lodged with the Secretary.

Mr. BARBOUR. The question Mr. Hersman asked relative to a provision of that sort is one which is usually covered by a provision in contracts for the sale of land in California, but as you stated a moment ago, what constitutes a total failure of crop is always open to construction.

Mr. MONDELL. The man might need a little time where there was only a partial failure of his crop much more than another man would need it where there was a total failure of his crop, because the other man might have some resources to fall back upon, whereas the man who has the partial failure might have none other than those he had to meet with what crops he had. I will say again that anything you gentlemen conclude is wise in detail in this matter I shall be very glad to give my assent to, possibly with reservations; but I doubt if it is wise to attempt to make suggestions with regard to that exercise of discretion which remains with the Secretary under the bill.

Mr. HERSMAN. Of course, I am simply asking these questions in order to clarify the matter in my own mind.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. Of course, there may be many other conditions. There may be a fire and a man may have all his buildings burned down, or floods may destroy his buildings and stock. Many things may occur which will render it practically impossible for a man to meet his obligations on the dates fixed, and there must be a little leeway and there must be some discretion to give the man an opportunity to pull out. Now, that rests with the Secretary within reasonable limits.

Mr. HERSEMAN. Is that discretion provided for in this bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Unquestionably, there is a discretion because of the obligation of payment.

Mr. HERSEMAN. No; but for further advances, in case these conditions do arise. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, that is another matter entirely.

Mr. HERSEMAN. How would we get at that, Mr. Mondell?

Mr. MONDELL. Under this bill, there are certain things definitely fixed. First, the man must pay 5 per cent in cash on the cost of his

land. Second, the maximum which he can borrow for improvements is \$1,200. Now, he may borrow it at one time or two times or three times, but he can only borrow \$1,200. He can borrow \$800 for live stock and implements. He need not borrow it all at once but can borrow it when he needs it. Now, whether that is enough is a matter for you gentlemen to determine. The men who have had to do with these things believe that there should be a maximum, and most of them were of opinion that that maximum fixed was perhaps as high as we could safely go at the beginning, in starting upon this work.

Mr. HERSEMAN. I would like to ask you one question right there, Mr. Mondell, and that is, would it not be wise to put in a provision here whereby the man carries insurance against accidents, so that in case an accident happened—

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). That is another matter of discretion. I am assuming that the instrument under which the Government is protected will carry with it the usual provisions with regard to insurance and all that sort of thing, but no man can insure his property for all that it is worth, and a total loss is never met by insurance, so that when I suggested as one of the things that might happen, a fire, that might burn his property, of course, I assumed the property would have to be insured, but no insurance covers total losses and it takes some time to collect insurance, and a man might be in position, by reason of a fire, whereby he would be unable to meet his obligations in the immediate future. I am assuming that all those things that are ordinarily required in contracts of that sort and in taking security for loans, all reasonable things, will be provided for under the administration of the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through, Mr. Mondell?

Mr. MONDELL. I have just been discussing these matters because gentlemen wanted me to.

Mr. SUMMERS. There is one question I would like to ask in reference to the provision for short-time loans not to exceed \$800 at any one time. Do the words "at any one time" mean until that loan has been repaid.

Mr. MONDELL. I am inclined to think it does. That, in a way, of course, would meet the suggestion made by Mr. Hersman. I am inclined to think that under the language as it stands, there might be successive loans, and of course you gentlemen want to determine whether that ought to be a provision of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Mondell.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank you very much for having so patiently listened to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we ought to come to some conclusion as to how long these hearings shall last. I have here a list of witnesses who desire to be heard, and perhaps some are only tentative. We have Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, and Gen. Cole, whom the Secretary of the Interior would like to have make a statement; Mr. Henry Sterling, representing the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Hernandez has a friend, and Mr. Smith has a friend who want to be heard. Mr. Atkeson, representing the National Grange, and Mr. Chamberlain, representing the Civic Betterments League, also desire to be heard. Mr. Chamberlain desires 15 minutes. Mr. Atkeson, would 15 minutes satisfy you?

Mr. ATKESON. Less than 15 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. May I add a couple of names? Mr. Hastings, a member of the House from my State, expressed a desire to come up here and say a few words on this bill, and also the governor of my State will be here next Monday afternoon on the Pennsylvania, and I would be glad if you would put him down to be heard.

I was going to make another suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and it may require more time than you would want to take, and if it does, I will withdraw it. This legislation is naturally going to interest every one of the States, and they have already been consulted on the subject more or less through Secretary Lane's office, and they all have an interest in it. How much trouble would we get into, or would it not be in the interest of justice, if the chairman issued an invitation to each State delegation to pick out one member of the delegation, and have him come here and present the views of the delegation, where they are in harmony, in a statement not to exceed 15 minutes apiece. I make that suggestion for the reason that the Government is to appoint one of these commissioners to appraise the land, the Farm Loan Board is to appoint one of them, if this bill prevails, and the Secretary of the Interior one of them. It is to be allied with the States right from the start, and it must be. Your project is to be in the State and the governor helps to select the lands to be used for this purpose, and I was wondering if that might not be a tactful suggestion, in order to get the members of the different States to confer with their governors and confer with their delegations and at least give them an opportunity to come in and make a statement of 15 minutes. That would take, of course, perhaps two or three days.

Mr. VAILE. That would probably save us some time on the floor of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. I had that in mind. There are many members who have come to me and said, "What is this land bill for the soldiers that we have had so many letters about from down home," and I think if the chairman would issue an invitation to them by delegations and ask them to at once call their delegations together and select some one to present the views of the delegation, you would cement the interests of all the States and it would probably be helpful on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It might enlist a good deal of active support.

Mr. FERRIS. I think it would.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask Mr. Ferris if his suggestion is meant to apply to the States that have members on this committee?

Mr. FERRIS. I think it should.

The CHAIRMAN. It should apply to all States.

Mr. FERRIS. I think it should. For instance, I could advise my State and you could advise Kansas, and Mr. Barbour could advise his State, and we would confer with a view to allowing each State to have "its nose in the pot," so to speak, and I think you would enlist a lot of interest, and I think you would educate them up on the matter, or at least cause them to educate themselves, and we might get some very helpful suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think it necessary to invite the States already represented upon the committee?

Mr. FERRIS. I would make it uniform, and if the members on the committee can be the judge on how he wants it handled from his State. If he wants to present it himself, all right, or he can have some one else do it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, do you know whether this bill has been submitted by the Secretary to the various governors or not, and whether he has conferred with them?

The CHAIRMAN. He has conferred with them on the general proposition quite extensively, and I have a great many communications which the Secretary has transmitted to the committee from different governors indorsing the project.

Mr. FERRIS. He has presented a lot of those things in connection with his report to the committee on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear from Mr. Cory on that. Mr. Cory is here representing the Secretary's office.

Mr. CORY. I am the engineer in charge of the southern district of 16 Southern States. Every State, except Mr. Ferris's State, has appointed a committee, and I have sent copies of the bill to each of the committee members and to each committee, and have asked for suggestions. I have heard from all of them, and they all have said that they are willing to come, but most of them say they have no appropriation, and if they come it will be money out of their own pockets, and it is a pretty far cry from here to Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ferris does not propose to invite representatives from the States but Representatives from the House.

Mr. CORY. Oh, that is another matter. These men are officially appointed by the governors to act officially in representing the States in this matter, and those men have all considered the bill and sent in their suggestions, and they have all said they would be very glad to come, but they have also added that unless it is necessary they would rather not come, because in most cases there is no money available to pay their expenses.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not suggest that we should bring them here because I know that would mean a delay and an expense which the committee would not want to have, but I think we could get these Congressmen here.

Mr. CORY. That is entirely different, of course.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me interrupt further to say that in reference to my own State, after I talked with you the other day and sent the telegram which you saw, I immediately got a telegram back from the governor saying that he would appoint anybody we wanted appointed, and would cooperate to the fullest extent, and he is coming here himself.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to ask you about the situation in Mississippi. For a while the governor was very much opposed to this measure.

Mr. CORY. I beg your pardon; I should have explained that. The governor of Mississippi has not appointed a committee. A State-wide committee has been appointed by a State-wide meeting, and the chairman of that is the commissioner of agriculture, Mr. P. P. Garner, and I am in touch with him, and he is the one who wrote back.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wanted to bring that to the knowledge of this committee because he is very antagonistic to it.

Mr. CORY. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON. And I have some amendments to offer to this bill in order to protect Mississippi's interests on that account. He is to name the appraisers under this bill and he declines to have anything to do with it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, unless the chairman would prefer me not to do it, I would move that it is the sense of the committee that our chairman, speaking for the committee, invite the several congressional delegations to select one member of their delegation to come here and make a statement not exceeding 15 minutes as to their viewpoint.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment? I want to ask Mr. Cory a question. Mr. Cory, what association was it you spoke of that had been notified—the Southern States Association?

Mr. CORY. No; I said I am simply the engineer in charge of the 16 Southern States.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the question I asked the chairman and I do not think you covered it: Have the governors of all the States been communicated with in reference to this legislation?

Mr. CORY. I think the governors of all the States have been communicated with about this legislation, but not directly with respect to this bill.

Mr. CORY. I think the governors of all States have been communicated with about this legislation—not directly with respect to this bill, because, with the exception of Mississippi and Oklahoma, the governors have named delegates and commissions, and I have communicated that bill to the chairman of the commission and not to the governors direct.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wanted to know whether the governors of the various States knew the tenor and purport of this particular bill. If not, I think it would be highly advisable to confer with the governors of the various States about this particular bill. I know that so far as my own State is concerned there would be no opposition to it, but I have felt that I would like to communicate with the governor of my State about this bill before it is reported out.

Mr. FERRIS. I think this is the situation: Of course, bills covering this same subject were introduced in the last session of Congress by Mr. Taylor and others. Mr. Taylor's bill went before the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands at that time, and they had some hearings upon it. There was very wide publicity given to it. Now, that was not this identical bill, but it was this identical subject. A hearing was had upon this same subject. I think the subject was sufficiently before them to give them a good idea of what we are doing here now, because this is almost the same bill. It is a modification of details rather than of substance.

Mr. CORY. And right at the close of the last session of Congress there was a conference of the governors.

Mr. FERRIS. It represents more a modification of details than of substance.

Mr. CORY. Yes; it is practically the same thing.

Mr. FERRIS. The amounts may be different and some of the limitations are different, but it is in other respects practically the same bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to state, that while I have not done so before, I would like to have an opportunity to be heard upon the bill. This subject had considerable consideration by myself before it came before the Committee on Irrigation, it is here in various forms, and while I do not desire personally to take the time of the committee, I would like to have the opportunity of being heard. I have never asked that before, although I introduced one of these bills. I would like to present my views on this legislation before the committee, and to that end I would like to have about 30 minutes time before the committee gets through.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you will have that opportunity, Judge Raker.

Mr. RAKER. Instead of talking on the amendments when they come up, there are some concrete ideas that have been discussed in various ways that might or might not assist the committee. I have been living in a part of the country where this work has been done for 40 years, and I have been working here in Congress for eight years. I have made it my business to investigate some of the features of it. If I am not imposing upon the committee, I would like to have the opportunity to present those ideas to them.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the committee will be glad to hear you. There is a motion before the committee, put by Mr. Ferris.

(The motion being put, it was unanimously adopted.)

STATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS C. ATKESON, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state whom you represent, Mr. Atkeson?

Mr. ATKESON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, unfortunately I am rather at a disadvantage in not being very well this morning, and so less than 15 minutes will satisfy me. I represent officially the organization in this country known as the Patrons of Husbandry. Some of you, perhaps, have heard of it by the name "The Grange." This organization is 53 years old, and it is made up entirely of producing farmers and their families. It has lived long enough to have learned some things by experience and by age. If it has not learned anything in these 53 years, it ought to have been chloroformed a good many years ago. Now, this organization has throughout the country a membership of nearly 1,000,000. It is not making much noise; it is not socialistic; it is not bolshevistic; but it represents the solid, conservative, producing, every-day working farmers of the country from Maine to California, with less strength in the cotton-growing States than in any other section of the country, and with its largest membership in the State of New York, there being something like 140,000 members in that State.

Now, this organization—or this national body, I might say—is made up of subordinate organizations or neighborhood organizations, and they constitute county organizations through their representatives; and then they have State organizations and a national organization. The national organization is made up by delegates from the various States. At its meeting in the city of Syracuse, N. Y., last November there were present about 3,000 representative farmers. They were not making much noise in the world, but they were the real thing—the men who earned their bread by the sweat of their

brow; the men who represent a conservative, dependable part of America's citizenship. Now, in that annual meeting at Syracuse last November the question of Secretary Lane's plan for taking care of the soldiers came up, and it was discussed deliberately and dispassionately, with the deepest sort of patriotism, and with a desire to do all things that human ingenuity could suggest that were reasonable and defensible in the interest of the American soldiers who had saved civilization on the battle front in France. It was developed that practically all the cities of the country and practically all the urban population were favorable to this proposition. I am not going into the details of Mr. Mondell's bill or any other specific proposition, but the country people or, the people on the farms, regard this plan in general as communistic, and we are not communists. Therefore they passed this brief resolution in reference to this proposition:

Farms for soldiers: We oppose the proposed plan of reclaiming swamp and arid lands for returning soldiers as unsound, impracticable, and detrimental to the interests of the Nation and agriculture.

There is an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all soldiers who may wish farm land. The Government should meet this need in this way so that they may become self-supporting and useful without waste and delay.

Mr. FERRIS. Where was that resolution passed?

Mr. ATKESON. Last November by the National Grange in its annual meeting held at Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. FERRIS. With how many members present?

Mr. ATKESON. There are about 1,000,000 individual members.

Mr. FERRIS. How many members were present?

Mr. ATKESON. Thirty-three States were represented, and there were approximately 3,000 farmers present. I can not tell you exactly the number.

Mr. FERRIS. Was the matter fully discussed there?

Mr. ATKESON. This proposition was discussed a full half day.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you recall who spoke on the subject?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; they were so numerous.

Mr. FERRIS. Did anybody present it from the viewpoint of the Interior Department?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; there was nobody from the Interior Department. We are recognizing the fact, of course, that everybody has the right to have his own position.

Mr. FERRIS. I simply wanted to see what consideration it had.

Mr. SMITH. This resolution indicates that they are in favor of reclaiming land in the northern and eastern sections of the country, but not in the South and West.

Mr. ATKESON. The organization is strong in the West—clear across the country from Maine to Oregon—but it is not strong in the Southern States.

The CHAIRMAN. Your resolution is particularly directed against the irrigation of the arid lands and the reclamation of swamp lands.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. The resolution is, in general terms, against the Lane plan.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, did anyone give the Secretary's view before that meeting? His purpose is not solely to reclaim the arid lands of the West, or the swamp lands of the South. The Secretary in his let-

ter particularly calls to the attention of the country the lands that are in the East, or the very lands that are referred to in the latter part of your resolution. He says here: "Within 50 miles of the city of Washington, both in the States of Maryland and Virginia, there are large bodies of land for development," and he goes on and calls to the attention of the country and to Congress the lands that are in the East, stating specifically that less than one-third of any funds appropriated can be devoted to the reclamation of the arid lands of the West. Who represented the State of Oregon at that meeting of the grange?

Mr. ATKESON. Mr. C. E. Spence, as I remember, was a member of the reconstruction committee, and he took a very active position. He is master of the Oregon State Grange.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Spence lives in the western part of the State, in the humid, rainy, part of the State of Oregon. What western members are upon your legislative or executive committee?

Mr. ATKESON. The executive committee was in this city this week. The executive committee is composed of Messrs. Sherman J. Lowell, of Fredonia, N. Y.; W. N. Cady, Middlebury, Vt.; Thomas C. Atkeson, of Buffalo, W. Va.; and Oliver Wilson, of Peoria, Ill.

The CHAIRMAN. And who composes your legislative committee?

Mr. ATKESON. The legislative committee is made up of Mr. Wilson, of Illinois, Mr. L. J. Taber, of Barnesville, Ohio, and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wilson is from Illinois?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are from West Virginia?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Taber is from Ohio?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no man west of the Mississippi River on either your legislative or your executive committee?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir. There is a reason for that, because most of our meetings are held in the East, and a man from California would have to travel a good ways to attend the meetings. I am not speaking for this committee, but I am speaking for this organization and the action it took at this meeting in Syracuse.

The CHAIRMAN. What familiarity have you yourself with irrigated lands?

Mr. ATKESON. I have spent several months on some of the Government projects in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. How long ago was that?

Mr. ATKESON. It was in 1916.

Mr. VAILE. Have you ever farmed irrigated land?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; and I do not want to.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the relative productivity of the irrigated lands and the other lands of the country?

Mr. ATKESON. I went over some irrigated lands in western Colorado that had once been occupied and that had been productive, but it was a desert and people were getting away from there. It was a blamed good place to get away from, they said. I was on the ground there.

Mr. RAKER. That does not apply to irrigated land in California.

Mr. ATKESON. I was speaking of Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not know that it is a fact that the irrigated lands upon the Government reclamation projects in the year 1917 produced per acre more than \$30 over the production of the general farm lands of the country, as shown by the last census reports?

Mr. ATKESON. I think that is true. I saw them thrashing wheat in Colorado that produced at the rate of 65 bushels per acre on irrigated land, but that was the most expensive wheat I ever saw thrashed. The cost of production on these irrigated lands, when you count the cost of getting the water there and all the things incidental to it, is very great. It is not cheap farming by any means. There are exceptions, of course, to that general rule.

Mr. SUMMERS. We are concerned at this particular time with this particular bill, which provides that the projects shall be selected—and that does not mean irrigation projects—with a view to the development of one or more projects in each of the several States in which suitable projects may be found. Therefore it is not an irrigation bill.

Mr. ATKESON. I understand that.

Mr. SUMMERS. I would like to say, further, if you are a little prejudiced against irrigation, that I have in my district the fourth agricultural county in the United States, producing last year \$33,000,000 worth of crops, \$30,000,000 of which was due to irrigation. That is a very creditable showing for irrigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Has your organization taken the same attitude toward the drainage of lands that they have toward the irrigated lands?

Mr. ATKESON. They object to the whole proposition, not as matters of detail, but in principle. Our objection is based upon a different theory that I am coming to—different from anything that has been brought out by any questions asked—and that is, we believe that this whole proposition is fundamentally un-American, undemocratic, undesirable, and indefensible.

The CHAIRMAN. In the last part of your resolution you state: "There is an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all soldiers who may wish to farm lands. The Government should meet this need in this way so that they may become self-supporting and useful without waste and delay."

Mr. VAILE. Would not that apply to some of the farm lands in Colorado that you say are deserted?

Mr. SMITH. It would seem that the scheme is all right in so far as it relates to the untenanted farms in the neighborhood where the members of this organization live, but that the same policy should not be applied to any other section of the country.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Chairman, here is a gentleman representing the largest farmers' organization in the United States. That organization has asked for 15 minutes in which to present its views, and I suggest that you allow this gentleman to use that 15 minutes, and then, if you want to cross-question him, do so. I think, however, that we should allow him to use that 15 minutes without being interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the committee will be willing to extend the gentleman's time.

Mr. ATKESON. I had come to the place where I could say all that I have to say in a very few minutes. What we say in favor of developing those untenanted and unoccupied farm lands is this, that they are available under our land-bank provisions to anybody who can avail himself of them as an individual. Our organization is fundamentally opposed to anything that is paternalistic, socialistic, communistic, bolshevistic, or anything of that kind. We can not understand why, if it is a good thing to provide farm homes at Government expense, or the means to make a living to the American soldier—and nobody has any more sympathy with them than we have—we should not set them up in the mercantile business, in the manufacturing business, or in some other business in competition with somebody else, rather than in competition with us, at Government expense. Now, you have the point in a nutshell. If there is any living many who can tell me why in providing for these soldiers you should not set them up in Washington city or some other city at Government expense, as well as to set them up in competition with me, I would like to hear it.

Mr. VAILE. I do not want to interrupt you, if you wish to proceed further along that line, but has your committee examined the particular provisions of this bill as to the sale of land to soldiers? Mr. ATKESON, did your committee examine the particular provisions of this bill with reference to the sale of the land to the soldiers?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. Did you observe that the price is to be as near as practicable the price of other land in that vicinity?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. And that nothing is given as a donation or gratuity?

Mr. ATKESON. Suppose you set them up in business in Washington—

Mr. VAILE (continuing). And I was going to state further that the purpose is to establish individual homes, the very opposite of socialism and bolshevism.

Mr. ATKESON. It is doing it at Government expense, which is State socialism.

Mr. SUMMERS. No; not at Government expense, because every dollar is to be repaid.

Mr. ATKESON. That is very doubtful, but, I would like you to meet the other proposition. Why shouldn't they set them up in business here?

Mr. VAILE. Why, indeed, should they not, if they pay for it?

Mr. ATKESON. Why don't you do it. We will withdraw our objection if you do that.

Mr. VAILE. If you can show us other lines of business which would be attractive to the soldiers, and which could be paid for by the soldiers, it might be well enough for us to go into that, but that is not the question which is before us now.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson, I would like to ask you a question and I will not take it out of your time. Secretary Lane replied to the specific point that you raise at the time the bill carried an appropriation of \$100,000,000, and here is what the Secretary had to say on that point:

"An appropriation of \$100,000,000"—of course this is now \$500,000,000—"would provide for the construction of projects containing

approximately 20,000 farms, or, as a rough estimate, a total of only about 1,500,000 acres of cultivated lands. There are at present in the United States nearly 7,000,000 farms, so that the addition of these 20,000 farms would mean an increase of less than one-third of 1 per cent. The improved land in farms amounts to something like 550,000,000 acres, so that the addition of 1,500,000 acres to this area already under cultivation could amount to less than three-tenths of 1 per cent. If continued for 10 years, the increase would be only 3 per cent, while the population is increasing five or six times as fast. It can readily be seen that there is little cause for alarm that overproduction and depression of prices of farm products would result from the construction proposed at the present time."

Now, that is the view of Secretary Lane upon that objection.

Mr. ATKESON. I have been over that with Secretary Lane.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Atkeson, will you pardon me—

Mr. ATKESON. There is just one other angle to this proposition that I want to present and then I am through.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to ask you a question before you close.

Mr. ATKESON. That is, as far as I am concerned, I am through. There is large agitation of the question of cheaper food products in this country and everybody wants everybody else to go back to the farm except himself, and we farmers have just got a little nauseated with that attitude in the public mind, and we are confronted with this condition, as I said to a prominent labor union man the other day, that eight hours a day and \$1 an hour means \$6 wheat, and I defy any man on my farm to produce it for less on that basis. Let me make one other statement. There are in this country to-day three jobs anxious to be done for every man in it.

Mr. FERRIS. Does Mr. Gompers agree with you about that?

Mr. ATKESON. But those jobs are out on the farms of this country and not in Washington or New York; and behind this propaganda is this idea—I will not say who is responsible for the idea—that this will afford employment for somebody immediately to go to work and reclaim this land in order that the wage scale of this country may be kept up. If you get cheaper food in this country, somebody has got to be paid an adequate wage and price in comparison with what men get for their time and energy in other occupations, or this country is going to go hungry. There is not any escape from that. We are paying right in this city now a carpenter, and a jack-leg carpenter at that, with hair grayer than mine, 85 cents an hour to do some little repairing. Since the 1st of January I have been living in this city, so I know something about city prices. I will say, absolutely, that wheat can not be produced on that scale at less than \$6 a bushel, and that means three times, approximately, what you paid for your biscuits this morning. Now, it means that or there won't be any biscuits. There is not any escape from that. I defy you to get away from it. For more than half a century I have been raising wheat that made biscuits, and I know what I am talking about when I get on that end of the agricultural problem.

Now, behind this propaganda are the people who want more farm produce and the people who want higher wages and don't want to earn them out on the farms of this country, and it is because of those things, as well as a number of other things, that our organization believes that this is absolutely indefensible. If somebody wants

a farm, under our farm-loan system he can find it and find it where he wants it. This other project takes a large area and at Government expense prepares it for cultivation and for competition with the farms that are already underfarmed. I could tell you people a lot of things that are absolutely prevailing at this day on the farms of this country that would interest you, to say the least of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. You stated a while ago that behind this proposition there was certain propaganda put out by certain people. Who are those people? You stated a while ago that the Southern States were not very well represented in the Grange, and I would like to know just who those people are.

Mr. ATKESON. As a general proposition the people in all the cities, regardless of occupation—and that represents about three out of four of our voting population—favor this scheme without regard to detail, but the people with whom it is to come in competition are practically unanimously opposed to it. Now, then, to reverse that, if you were to spend \$500,000,000 of the public money to put the returned soldiers in competition with the manufacturing business or the mercantile business, or any other business that affects this three-fourths of our population, somebody would squeal.

Mr. VAILE. Let me cite you a case in practically every city of this country, and right here in Washington. There are hospitals where men who formerly had no particular occupation, except that of serving their country recently, are now being made into plumbers, carpenters, and electricians and trained for all the trades.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes. They are also being trained in agriculture, and we heartily indorse that whole plan of vocational education. This is not setting them up in business.

Mr. VAILE. They do not pay for that training, and every one of those men is being returned to industry and put in competition—established in business, virtually—with somebody who is now in it. But we do not hear any squeal about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Atkeson, let me ask you a question. Do you think it was a proper thing for the United States Government to pass the act giving soldiers of the War of 1812 land grants?

Mr. ATKESON. I think so.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do you agree with the legislation enacted after the Civil War giving the Civil War soldiers homesteads?

Mr. ATKESON. I have no objection to that; but it broke up many farmers in the East.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do you agree with that? Do you think it was right to do that?

Mr. ATKESON. I think it was very questionable. You can go through New York and New England, and through my own State, and see the effect of that. When you got west of the Mississippi it did not have that effect; but it practically paralyzed agriculture for nearly half a century.

Mr. GRAHAM. What I am trying to get at is—

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to the homestead laws?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. What I am trying to get at is whether you think it was wrong to do that?

Mr. ATKESON. I think it was wrong to break up one class of citizenship by the Government setting up competition.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then, if your association had been passing upon that, you would have opposed the homestead laws of 1863?

Mr. ATKESON. We are opposed to wholesale homestead laws.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, would you have been opposed to the laws that were passed?

Mr. ATKESON. It is just a question of whether you are going to set up competition at Government expense with any important element of its citizenship.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, you appreciate that that was done largely on account of the services that those men had rendered to their Government.

Mr. ATKESON. Well, it was open to anybody.

Mr. GRAHAM. And that element also enters into this legislation.

Mr. ATKESON. All a man had to do was to be able to get out there, and, as somebody said, "while he was getting, get a plenty."

Mr. FERRIS. There were special courtesies accorded to soldiers that the ordinary citizen did not have.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand so.

Mr. ATKESON. With three-fourths of the voters of this country living in the cities, the man on the farm don't have very much show.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson, let me call your attention to this. The resolutions to which you have called our attention is preceded by this resolution passed at the meeting to which you have referred:

Land tenantry: Land tenantry is increasing; farm ownership is concentrating in the hands of wealthy land holders and abandoned farms are becoming too common. Legislation should be devised to encourage farm-home owning and to discourage land speculation and tenantry.

Mr. ATKESON. Isn't that sound?

Mr. VAILE. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Atkeson, let me ask you this question. You appear to be opposed to this legislation which is intended to benefit the soldiers, and incidentally, to reduce the high cost of living to people who work for daily wages. What is your solution of the problem confronting the country when you have to pay 50 or 60 cents for beefsteak and \$12 and \$15 a barrel for flour? What is your solution of that problem?

Mr. ATKESON. I have not any solution, and no one else seems to have any, but this is a fact, and it covers more than half a century, the average farmer in this country, in order to make ends meet and make a living has worked from 12 to 15 hours a day and his children from 2 years of age to old age have worked about that many hours. Now, that has come to a sudden stop in this country. Farm hands are quitting on an eight-hour day and the farmers are now advocating the discontinuance of any labor on the part of their children under 16 years of age, and they will make an effort to stop every man's plow in the furrow at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. BARBOUR. Have the farmers in your country tried the eight-hour day?

Mr. ATKESON. Oh, yes; we are doing that now on my farm down in West Virginia.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it working successfully?

Mr. ATKESON. We are absolutely working on an eight-hour day.

Mr. SUMMERS. Is it not a fact that the sons of those very farmers would very largely be the beneficiaries of this act?

Mr. ATKESON. I do not think anybody would be a beneficiary. I am here presenting this matter only in a representative capacity. My personal belief is that it would not hurt anybody very much, because the opportunity to get on a farm to the people who want to get there is wide open, and we are inviting them to come in, and we are trying to prevent tenantry, and the safest part of our citizenship is the land-owning farmer citizenship, but we do not believe it should be brought about by direct Government donation.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned until Saturday, May 31, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Saturday, May 31, 1919.

The committee this day met, Hon. N. J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will be in order. Mr. Chamberlain, the committee would be pleased to hear your statement. Tell the committee who you are and whom you represent.

STATEMENT OF MR. HOYT CHAMBERLAIN, SECRETARY NATIONAL CIVIC BETTERMENT LEAGUE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I represent the National Civic Betterment League, with an organization in 45 States, an organization which, as its name indicates, is working along broad lines of civic betterment. I have been sent here by this organization to try to present one or two phases of this soldier's and sailor's settler act which, from the reflex of our members, appears to our organization to be extremely important.

First, I wish to state that the attitude of this committee, the personnel of this committee, has been one of great gratification. The interest shown, the desire to get at the facts, at the purposes of this bill, are to my mind an index of a searching, careful, broad act which will protect the interests of the Government as well as the proposed beneficiaries under the act.

I will digress for one moment to express the surprise I experienced in this committee room on Thursday that the representative of a great national organization like the National Grange should put himself in an attitude so unfortunate, and I feel reflecting a misrepresentation of what would be the attitude of most of the members of the grange if they had been knowing of the true import of this bill. Mr. Atkinson's statements might be taken seriously were they not so manifestly absurd and contradictory. The attitude of Mr. Atkinson and the grange brings to mind a bunch of our men in Jackson County, Mo., who, after the coming of the local option law, started to form a cooperative bar. Everything went lovely until the question came up as to who should be barkeeper, and on that point there developed some difference of opinion, so to keep peace in the organization they concluded to take a ballot as to who should be barkeeper,

and when the ballots were looked over each man had one vote. I can not help thinking if Mr. Atkinson had been a member of that cooperative association he would have gotten one vote, inasmuch as he was voting for himself, talking for himself from a narrow standpoint before this committee.

One of the points which I wish to put stress on, and really it is hardly necessary before this committee, is the need, the urgency of the enactment of this legislation. These men are home again after an experience which has tried their souls. As quickly as the great harvests are over these men, a great many of them, probably more than 50 per cent of them, from the experience I have had and the personal contact with them in different parts of the country, are going to find themselves without employment in what has previously been their chosen vocations.

Granting for the sake of argument that many of them will find temporary employment in the harvests, as quickly as that work is over they will find their way back to the larger places, where there is not the place for them. Doctors, lawyers, professional men find their practices dissipated, and they are unable to pick up where they left off. Clerks, various mechanics find themselves, and will find themselves, out of employment, away from the conditions that they have been working under, and will look to this Congress, to this committee, to enact something which will give them the same kind of opportunities which were given to the veterans of the Civil War, only we hope on broader and more comprehensive lines; by all means legislation which will give them employment away from the centers of population. And by personal conversation with hundreds of these men I find that they are desirous of getting back to the land in a practical way. The urgency of this legislation, whatever it shall be, is of the utmost importance, that these men may be put to work as quickly as possible.

The other thing that I wish to speak to this committee about is the question of human interest. The civic conditions in the larger cities of this country are deplorable. The status in the larger cities is one of a political oligarchy which is dominated by a few men who use the men in the lower wards, in the wards of the cities where the population has not the opportunity, the advantages, to make its way; for all practical purposes these political agencies prostitute them. From every standpoint and from the viewpoint of our league in particular, which seeks to alleviate and better these civic conditions, these men should keep away from those places—these population centers.

It does not require any statement from me to emphasize the importance, and particularly for men who have come from the country, of urging and encouraging them in a practical way to get back to the environment of the country, where they can make their way under conditions which they have been raised in, just as fast as possible.

I earnestly hope, and on behalf of the league I desire to express the confidence I feel, after having attended these hearings, that this committee of Congress will be fully equal to the responsibilities which are before them in this act, and put into force promptly, without delay, action which will permit very largely the solving of the unemployment in this country through the return of a large number of men overseas. Gentlemen, I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chamberlain, will you give the committee some further information about your league—its organization and membership?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. Our organization is one which works quietly. We avoid publicity and brass-band methods. Our members are largely made up of merchants, quite a sprinkling of professional men, clerical men and women, people who are thoughtful, who see the trend of events with reference to trouble which may ensue when enough people are unemployed. It has been aptly written that the idle brain is the devil's workshop. To keep a man busy is his salvation. The league has had, and is to-day having, cases dealing with abuses not only in cities but in large institutions which produce in an agricultural way on a large scale. For instance, we have not long ago had to deal with a situation with reference to the sugar-beet culture in Nebraska. There seemed to exist there a condition where, owing to there being but one market for the beets, the producers were almost required to sell for whatever was offered them for their product. The realization was entirely different from the promises held out to them. The conditions under which they were working and paid were represented to us to be very unsatisfactory. I am bound to state that when the conditions were brought to the attention of those in charge I think there was an honest effort made to relieve them.

MR. RAKER. Mr. Chamberlain may have stated it, but I did not get it. What is your home?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. My home is at Kansas City.

MR. RAKER. What is your business?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. Financial broker.

MR. RAKER. How long have you been in that business?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. I have been in that immediate line, so far as war conditions would permit, since 1905.

MR. RAKER. Before that were you ever a farmer?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. I have been a farmer, a practical farmer.

MR. TAYLOR. How old an organization is that and how extensive are its numbers?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. It is altogether a voluntary organization, voluntary, too, as to maintenance, money contributions. We have been working since 1897. Our organization to-day is more than 23 years old. I would state that judging from the total of our roll—and we judge that by a review every three years of our lists and the checking up of correspondence which we have from members—we have at this time in the neighborhood of 185,000 members.

MR. RAKER. Your business is to better conditions for laboring men in cities and city conditions generally?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. More especially in the cities and in the larger towns.

MR. RAKER. Its work has not been to go out into the country and make conditions for the country boy and girl better?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; that is also our business.

MR. RAKER. But you have not devoted much time to that?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN. Not so much as to urban conditions.

MR. RAKER. Your idea—I just took a little memorandum here—was that legislation should be enacted for the purpose of giving the unemployed employment; is that your theory of this bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, that is only the first thing. Our conception—I do not know whether it is correct or not—is that the bill is designed first to give employment to our returning service men and women, and then those men and women, being able, as I understand they will be under the terms of this act, to take their choice, their pick, of the different sites on which they may engage in the preparatory work, will be able to determine, when they are through with the preparatory labor, whether that particular district where they have been working, they are satisfied with. A great many people go to places, and after being there a short time do not like them. That is only natural, and we have felt—I am speaking now for the organization, as their ideal has been reflected to me as its secretary—that if the workers on the preparatory work proposed by the various projects under this bill should not be satisfied where they have been working, that they may go to some other project and become settlers, rather than the one with which they may have become dissatisfied for one reason or another.

Mr. RAKER. It is not your theory that we are trying to enact legislation for the unemployed in this bill, is it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For the unemployed?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Soldiers and sailors.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your purpose, is it your theory that we are trying to enact legislation to give all the soldiers, whether employed or not, a home?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly, if they wish a home.

Mr. RAKER. You would not have any objection to giving a man one of these places, one of these homes, and let him go and file on it and improve it, whether he worked on the project or not, would you?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not at all; but we speak, first, of the problem of employment.

Mr. RAKER. But I thought this bill was for the purpose of giving to the soldiers, those who participated in this war, some recognition because of their service as American soldiers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is also my understanding.

Mr. TILLMAN. Incidentally, it would be employment, too?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. My understanding of the purpose of the act is to give employment to the unemployed service men, preferably.

Mr. RAKER. Will you tell the committee how and what legislation can be enacted whereby we can go into these cities and get these boys and girls out of the cities and get them out on the farm, when they have no inclination for farming; get them out on the farm and get them to work and make a home for themselves?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state this, that from the experience and contact I have had by correspondence and personally with thousands of our members, I find that there is abroad in this country a feeling of unrest. People are not satisfied. I am speaking now of working people, thoughtful, conservative working people. There is a feeling of dissatisfaction among them. This feeling, as regards existence at home during the absence of the heads of these families abroad, has been greatly augmented, largely by reason of the high cost of living. Thousands of our correspondents—our members—believe that the

time has come when, if they can with reasonable Government aid locate in a place or places climatically congenial, with a proper degree of care and instruction in farming and practical agriculture, they can find a greater measure of satisfaction under rural conditions than they can possibly do under the conditions existent to-day where, owing to the high cost of living, the average man working for a wage, by the time he has settled his living for a month, has done little more than swap dollars.

Mr. BENHAM. You speak of the conditions from the standpoint of the laborer on the farm. Are you acquainted at the present time with labor conditions on the farm, that is as to the demand for it on the farm?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; I have been pretty close to that in the last two months—especially in the last two months.

Mr. BENHAM. I have been for several years, and still am, and my observations are not in harmony with yours. Do you mean to leave the impression with this committee that men desiring to labor on the farm can not get employment 12 months in the year on the farm?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I certainly do, for the most part. In the periods of great harvests in the West there is always a hue and cry raised—a fear of loss of crops by reason of insufficient labor in the fields. It necessarily follows that to protect these crops a great influx of temporary labor is necessary. It naturally follows that when the harvests are made, there is no longer any need for that unusual influx of labor.

Mr. BENHAM. Is that a theory or a practical fact?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is a practical fact, to my knowledge, and I think that the Western Members, more especially, also I think that Illinois Members will perhaps bear this out, that there is always a great demand for extra labor at harvest periods.

The CHARMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, if there are no further questions to ask, we have with us Mr. Sterling, of the American Federation of Labor, who has to make a statement before another committee at a quarter past 11.

STATEMENT OF MR. HENRY STERLING, LEGISLATIVE AGENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D C.

The CHAIRMAN. State your name and tell the committee whom you represent.

Mr. STERLING. My name is Henry Sterling. I am legislative agent for the American Federation of Labor. I am living just now in Washington. My original home is Boston.

Mr. TAYLOR. How long have you occupied this position?

Mr. STERLING. Since last August. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to read to you, first, the official declaration of the organization on this particular point. In its reconstruction program it states:

Legislation also should be enacted which will give the Nation's defenders the opportunity for easy and ready access to the land. Favorable inducements should be provided for them to enter agriculture and husbandry. The Government should assume responsibility for the allotment of such lands, and supply the necessary capital for its development and cultivation, with such safeguards as will protect both the Government and the discharged soldier and sailor.

You will note there, Mr. Chairman, that our point of view is, first of all, the soldier and his opportunity. Of course, we have also in view the matter of unemployment, which probably has been thrashed to death before your committee—although I do not know whether it has or not. I assume it has to quite a degree.

We are not deceived, Mr. Chairman, or carried away by any delusion that one hundred of every hundred soldiers desire to become a farmer, or desire a country life, or anything of that kind, nor are we deceived into the idea that all of those in the cities, aside from soldiers and sailors, are enamored with country life. We believe they are in the cities because they want to be in the cities, because they enjoy its bright lights, its movies, and its close contact with humanity. Many of them came from the farm and do not want to go back. People in the cities are there because they want to be there and we are not deluded into the idea that all these returning soldiers are going to rush to the farm, or anything of that kind, but a careful study and investigation in the tenements in Boston, and the experience of other nations, shows, Mr. Chairman, that out of those who are in cities, about 10 per cent of the workers—whether they be soldiers or not—10 per cent of the workers do desire to take advantage of some such opportunity as will afford them a foothold in the country districts and a chance to live a newer and a different and a better life. Now, if to that 10 per cent among the soldiers—Mr. Secretary Lane figures it might possibly be 50 per cent; I remember hearing him state those figures the other day when I was in here a few moments—it might possibly reach a much higher per cent than 10 per cent, but, Mr. Chairman, the offer of that opportunity to all returning soldiers is what would give credit to the Union, to the Government, to the people of this Nation, the bare offer of it, and, in so far as it is taken advantage of, we have a solution to that extent of the matter of employment for soldiers.

It is not my belief that this is a solution for unemployment, this proposition. It is a relief for unemployment, Mr. Chairman. It is a relief to the general ranks of labor, because if only 10 per cent, the minimum number of soldiers, takes advantage of it, then there is the relief to the extent of at least 300,000 workers. Night before last, I think it was, I read in the evening papers the statement from the Labor Department that in so many cities, and it stated the number of cities—it occurs to me it was 30 cities—there were 327,000 unemployed looking for work now. I am not going to stay on that point.

Mr. SNELL. Did not that same statement say that the conditions were fast adjusting themselves and reaching a nearer level than they had in some time?

Mr. STERLING. They have been saying that since last Christmas.

Mr. SNELL. I saw that statement, and if I remember correctly it said that the conditions were growing for the betterment of employment all the time.

Mr. STERLING. It said the conditions were much better than they were the week before. I remember that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sterling, you have assumed that we have had considerable information on the matter of unemployment. The committee has had very little so far from anyone claiming to speak with absolute knowledge or precision on the subject.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to address myself to it, then, for a little while, merely only on this small excuse, that if we pass this bill and a certain number of soldiers go out there, it makes no difference whether it is a large number or whether it is a small number, the tendency is to relieve unemployment to a certain degree.

This particular proposition or this method of dealing with the land question and the labor question, Mr. Chairman, is no new thing. You probably know that it has been more or less dealt with all over the world, but in New Zealand and small colonies it has been more thoroughly dealt with than in any other nation in the world, and I think that the facts of that situation that I can give you will be new to the committee.

In 1892 and 1893, ———, in commenting on New Zealand, spoke of it as a country infested with tramps, with soup kitchens, and shelter sheds along the highways and byways, where the unemployed might sleep for a night. That is something we never heard of in this country, Mr. Chairman, that is a condition a little worse than we have ever known here. We have known of soup kitchens and midnight bread lines, and things like that, but to erect shelter sheds along the highways where the unemployed might spend the night is a little further than we have ever gone.

In 1893 the Government inaugurated a policy similar to this here, and followed it extensively and is doing it up to the present day. The Government bought lands, subdivided them, prepared and made roads and bridge and things like that, and offered the lands at cost price to the Government and easy terms to whoever desired to take them. After the man was given his allotment of land, he was given loans with which to till it.

The CHAIRMAN. This is in New Zealand that you are speaking of?

Mr. STERLING. This is in New Zealand, Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of 1893, and I want to tell the result of that policy.

Mr. SNELL. How did they get title to this land? Did the government give them to them outright?

Mr. STERLING. No, some of the titles were short-term leases, and some long-term leases, for 99 years, and some were in fee simple.

Mr. SNELL. How did these tramps and these fellows get the first initial start to buy these lands?

Mr. STERLING. It is not quite to be supposed that it was the actual tramps that took those places; it was other workers, and possibly the tramps took their jobs, but I am not sure about that. But it was simply a general bill, and the communities and those who wanted that kind of thing and could qualify had to have a few dollars to begin with in order to acquire title to the land.

Mr. SNELL. Were not the original land laws in that country entirely different from this country? Were not the lands, as a whole, owned by large estates, and they had to be divided, and there was no way of doing it unless the government did it?

Mr. STERLING. That is largely true.

Mr. SNELL. Is not that the absolute fact?

Mr. STERLING. It is largely true, but it was also true——

Mr. SNELL. Largely true? Is it not a fact?

Mr. STERLING. There was also a very large tract of wild land that never had been touched, that had not been acquired by any estates.

It is true that, following the English custom, English families were acquiring large blocks of territory and holding it together and using it for patrimony for the family later on.

Mr. SNELL. But if you had the money to buy it you could not have gone in at that time and bought 100 acres of land, could you?

Mr. STERLING. You could not do it.

Mr. SNELL. So the laws are entirely different in that country than they are here, under the conditions you are speaking about?

Mr. STERLING. The land there was more fully absorbed by such processes than it is here.

Mr. SNELL. Was it not absolutely?

Mr. STERLING. The conditions here, though, are just the same. Every piece of land that might be at all available to a returning soldier is absorbed and covered. No; it was not absolutely, but it was almost entirely so.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Sterling, perhaps you and I think differently. As I understood the conditions in New Zealand, the land was largely held in large tracts, and if you or I went over there and had the money to buy it, we could not get title to 100 acres of land, and it was necessary to have some government action before a small landowner could ever get any land. In this country, if a man has the money, or had \$5,000, he could buy 5 acres, 10 acres, 100 acres. It is all divided up into small holdings now, but those were the land conditions existing in New Zealand in 1893.

Mr. STERLING. Your statement is mainly true, but in the extreme way in which you put it it is not true.

Mr. SNELL. In just what way is it not true? I would like to get information, if I am wrong.

Mr. STERLING. There was an enormous number of these large estates. There was also considerable land to be bought in small communities at high prices. Now, as I was proceeding to state, Mr. Chairman, the government, through the right of eminent domain, took some of the estates. Some of them were purchased under ordinary negotiations. The first of them that was taken were called the escheated estate and was not taken under this particular clause or this particular method, but it consisted of about seventy or eighty thousand acres of land, and was operated by seventy or eighty servants, and had about seventy or eighty thousand head of cattle and sheep. The government bought it for a million and a quarter and divided it, and three years afterwards there was a population of 1,500 on the place, with churches and schools and stores and the usual amenities of life in a small community.

Carrying out that policy, Mr. Chairman, for 20 years, with a country in the condition in which I have cited, in 1911, when the census was taken as they do there, they took a census of the unemployed, and the exact figure, as it lies in my mind, of all classes of unemployed in 1911 was 1.97 per cent of the workers, less than 2 per cent. In Massachusetts, where I was living at the time, Mr. Chairman, the percentage of employment appeared to be 10.4 per cent. When New Zealand had practically no unemployment this country had between three and four million of workers able to work and willing to work, eager to work, and needing to work, that could not find a job,

Mr. SNELL. Let me ask you a question right here. Do you claim that all the people that are unemployed, classed as unemployed throughout this country, as the unemployed element, are eager, willing, and want to work?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, the condition of unemployment is the most demoralizing condition to the workers that we have in our civilization, not excepting even, I think, the drinking. It demoralizes them and makes them subservient to the habit of going without work, and soon grows into a reluctance to go to work, and that reluctance grows into a distaste for work. And this manner of unemployment, Mr. Chairman, out of some of the finest workmen that America has ever produced, has bred tramps that have infested the highways and railways. That is one of the indictments against unemployment, and that, I think, Mr. Congressman, should answer your question, should it not?

Mr. SNELL. Well, partly, but, of course, a large amount of the unemployment in this country has been caused by the people not wanting work. I know that in various small villages, and in the village that I live in, there is always 15, 20, or 30 men standing on the street corner that you could not hire to work for more than one or two days in a week to save your life.

Mr. STERLING. That statement, again, is so extreme that it is not accurate.

Mr. SNELL. That applies to every small village in the country, and they are all listed as unemployed, and when you take that statement of 10 per cent and apply it to the whole country, that is a fairly extreme statement, I think.

Mr. STERLING. The statement that unemployment is caused to any great extent by people who will not work is an extreme statement.

Mr. SNELL. I would not say to a great extent, but to a considerable extent I claim it is so.

Mr. STERLING. During the war, Mr. Chairman, when opportunities for work were very common in this country, in the State of Massachusetts the percentage of unemployment dropped to 1, 1.1, and 3. Now, Mr. Chairman, those are very significant figures. It means that in Massachusetts it was almost impossible to find a man who was not at work.

The CHAIRMAN. That was during the war?

Mr. STERLING. That was during the war, when the opportunities for work were so good, and it contradicts the Congressman's statement there.

Mr. SNELL. We had a special law at that time that a man must work or fight, so a lot of these fellows went to work.

Mr. STERLING. There was some thought of passing a law, Mr. Chairman, at the behest of employers who desired to underpay men and put other conditions on them which they did not wish to submit to, and if they refused to work, then the employers could notify the military and send them into the Army. That measure did not go through, Mr. Congressman; so when you state that we had a law—

Mr. SNELL. Did they not have a society for general employment in this country?

Mr. STERLING. We had a law of that kind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNELL. I admit that statement is correct, but it was advertised all over the country that you must work or fight.

Mr. VAILE. That was put into effect in a great many communities by State law.

Mr. RAKER. Was not this the real, true situation, as resulted in my State? For many years, in 1896 and 1897, and many years along there, when the roads were infested with tramps, that during the war every community had a commission or board, a voluntary board, and no man could stay in the town two days but what they found a job for him, and if he did not take the job he had to get out. Is not that the true situation?

Mr. STERLING. It is absolutely the fact that they had these things.

Mr. RAKER. Not only these things, but did it not put these men to work, and is it not a fact that where before 15 or 20 would be around a little town of 1,500 inhabitants, that during the war you did not find a man that was not at work? From the time he landed in the town the people were after him and found a job for him, and if he did not go to work he had to go to some other place?

Mr. STERLING. They did that, and we know that in 1896 and 1897, along there, during those years when there were 4,000,000 of them—that is to say, during the war there were opportunities of work, and if the man himself would not go to work the community would crowd him to go to work, and they all went to work?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Sterling, what are the conditions now?

Mr. STERLING. The conditions now are that in the country districts there are not enough men to fill the jobs on the farms; is that true?

Mr. SNELL. Absolutely, so far as I am able to find out.

Mr. STERLING. In some city districts there are more workers than there are jobs, to the extent that the figures I gave to the Congressman confirm.

Mr. SNELL. In about 30 cities they claim there is a slight excess of labor.

Mr. STERLING. In about 30 cities there were 300,000 men out of work.

Mr. SNELL. How does that compare with the average year, the number of cities having an excess of labor?

Mr. STERLING. I have the unemployment statement, Mr. Chairman, here, since March 31, 1909, and rather than read all those figures in percentages, for the information of the committee, if you desire I will leave the pamphlet with you.

The CHAIRMAN. On what page is that data?

Mr. STERLING. It is on page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it may be printed in the record.

Mr. STERLING. The following comparative statement shows the number at the close of each quarter since 1908.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

[Employment—Dec. 31, 1918; p. 10.]

III. UNEMPLOYMENT OF ORGANIZED WAGE EARNERS.

The following comparative statement shows the number and membership of the organizations reporting at the close of each quarter since 1908, also the number of members unemployed and the corresponding percentages. For the purpose of emphasizing the comparisons the data for the close of the fourth quarter in each year are printed in full-face type.

TABLE 3.—Unemployment of organized wage earners.

Quarters ending—	Number reporting.		Unemployed, all causes.		Unemployed owing to lack of work or material.	
	Unions.	Members-ship.	Members.	Percent-ages.	Members.	Percent-ages.
Mar. 31, 1909.....	777	105,059	11,997	11.4	9,980	9.5
June 30, 1909.....	780	105,944	6,736	6.4	4,913	4.6
Sept. 30, 1909.....	797	113,464	5,451	4.8	3,873	3.4
Dec. 31, 1909.....	830	107,689	10,084	9.4	5,248	4.9
Mar. 31, 1910.....	837	117,082	8,262	7.1	6,186	5.3
June 30, 1910.....	841	121,849	8,518	7.0	6,570	5.4
Sept. 30, 1910.....	845	118,781	6,624	5.6	4,687	4.0
Dec. 31, 1910.....	862	122,621	12,517	10.2	8,938	7.3
Mar. 31, 1911.....	889	122,002	12,738	10.4	9,120	7.5
June 30, 1911.....	897	135,202	8,927	6.6	5,669	4.2
Sept. 30, 1911.....	975	133,540	7,527	5.6	4,904	3.7
Dec. 30, 1911 ¹	905	125,484	12,167	9.7	7,568	6.0
Mar. 30, 1912 ¹	942	161,825	22,738	14.1	8,185	5.1
June 29, 1912 ¹	974	134,940	7,088	5.3	4,540	3.4
Sept. 30, 1912.....	972	145,673	6,952	4.7	4,407	3.0
Dec. 31, 1912.....	994	174,359	15,914	9.1	11,164	6.4
Mar. 31, 1913.....	1,022	170,970	19,329	11.3	12,493	7.3
June 30, 1913.....	1,037	172,343	11,116	6.4	7,473	4.3
Sept. 30, 1913.....	1,059	177,267	12,010	6.8	7,537	4.3
Dec. 31, 1913.....	1,081	178,182	18,574	10.4	13,069	7.3
Mar. 31, 1914.....	1,082	173,327	22,347	12.9	15,917	9.2
June 30, 1914.....	1,095	183,202	18,122	9.9	12,576	6.9
Sept. 30, 1914.....	1,010	166,816	18,302	11.0	14,140	8.5
Dec. 31, 1914.....	1,024	165,762	30,258	18.3	24,629	14.9
Mar. 31, 1915.....	1,076	171,997	28,486	16.6	21,951	12.8
June 30, 1915.....	1,092	162,315	17,262	10.6	12,241	7.6
Sept. 30, 1915.....	1,052	175,754	12,328	7.0	6,325	3.6
Dec. 31, 1915.....	1,026	168,122	14,389	8.6	6,709	4.0
Mar. 31, 1916.....	1,029	178,434	15,484	8.6	7,010	3.9
June 30, 1916.....	1,017	173,179	7,358	4.2	2,323	1.3
Sept. 30, 1916.....	1,021	180,557	7,046	3.9	3,358	1.9
Dec. 30, 1916 ¹	1,039	171,877	10,313	6.0	4,708	2.7
Mar. 31, 1917.....	1,042	194,211	14,271	7.3	7,193	3.7
June 30, 1917.....	979	165,529	13,846	8.4	5,849	3.5
Sept. 29, 1917 ¹	1,077	195,309	10,866	5.6	5,237	2.7
Dec. 31, 1917.....	1,093	201,404	14,900	7.4	7,131	3.5
Mar. 30, 1918 ¹	1,226	228,867	13,843	6.0	6,970	3.0
June 29, 1918 ¹	1,093	212,181	6,324	3.0	2,094	1.0
Sept. 30, 1918.....	1,133	227,286	13,637	6.0	2,486	1.1
Dec. 31, 1918.....	1,112	221,005	20,981	9.5	11,629	5.3

¹ As the last day of this quarter fell on Sunday, the previous day was taken as the date for which information was requested.

² The percentage (14.1) was unusually high because the number reported as unemployed included over 9,000 organized textile workers in Lowell who were involved in a strike pending on Mar. 30, 1912.

³ Exclusive of members who were ill with influenza, the percentage unemployed for all causes would have been less than 3.

According to returns received from 1,112 labor organizations in Massachusetts at the close of December, 1918, representing 221,005 members, 9.5 per cent of the total membership were unemployed for all causes, as compared with 6.0 per cent at the close of September, 1918, and with 7.4 per cent at the close of December, 1917. A large number of those who were reported as unemployed at the close of the quarter were absent from work because of influenza, but the number absent for this cause was far less than at the close of September when the epidemic was at its height in Massachusetts.

MR. RAKER. Might I just ask a question right there? You have made the statement to the committee, and you have given this matter a lot of thought, and it will be of value to the committee, that in the country districts all over the Nation there is a scarcity of labor and

in the cities there is a surplus. Now, as the conditions exist now, what is your remedy for getting those fellows out of the city on to the farms, and in the country?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, that is substantially the question which the Congressman asked of the previous speaker. It is to-day an exceedingly large problem in civilization. The population is tending toward the cities all over the world, and the cities are becoming congested all over the world, and the country districts are becoming more or less depopulated all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in coming here was to urge that you pass this bill so as to give every soldier the opportunity, as a recognition of his service, and incidentally I desire to say that it would be of some value to the community as a whole, it would be of some value, though not a great deal, in solving this problem which the gentleman propounded.

I have a theory, Mr. Congressman, as to the ultimate solution, the ultimate answer to the question which you have put, but such a theory involves sharp points and corners and angles, and would raise a lot of discussion on the floor the same as I have been in this morning on disputed points, and I do not want to get away from the better thing and the urgency and the desire that I have that you pass the bill in order to give the soldier and sailor this opportunity, utterly regardless of whether it is going to be of benefit to anybody else or not. It is true at the same time that they will not all take advantage of it, but they will all have the opportunity if you pass the bill, Mr. Chairman, and maybe in later years many who would perhaps reject with some contempt the proposition to-day, perhaps in many years to come, when harder times come to them, if they do come, they will be glad then to take the opportunity.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Sterling, can you say that you represent the American Federation of Labor, and that the American Federation of Labor, from one end of this country to the other, is in favor of this measure?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, there is a question that I was asked day before yesterday before a committee. I was there officially, representing the American Federation of Labor. In its annual convention and in many other meetings it had taken specific action and had resolved in favor of the proposition, in favor of our daylight saving. Yet there were Congressmen there present who had from their districts certain resolutions passed by certain labor organizations in their districts. Now, our organization consists of 3,500,000 men. It is entirely a voluntary organization, the most democratic organization on the face of the earth. They meet in official session, and they adopt these resolutions, perhaps one resolution or another resolution on the matter, and sometimes they express the absolutely unanimous opinion of practically every member in the organization, and sometimes, as on the daylight-saving proposition and on women suffrage, they express the majority feeling, where there is a vast difference of opinion, both individual and in the organization.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you want this committee to understand, that you do represent the organization, or that you do not; that you represent the Federation or what?

Mr. STERLING. I represent the organization, Mr. Chairman, and this is one of the questions on which, so far as we know, there is ab-

solutely no division of opinion whatsoever. So far as we can state at this moment, it has been properly and officially adopted, and so far as we can tell or we have had any notice of, from one end of the country to the other the three and a half million members are unanimously in favor of it. That is the strongest indorsement I can give you from the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I came to win the good will of the committee in behalf of the measure. I want to make as pleasing and strong an impression as I can in behalf of that particular measure. You will bear me out when I state that I used my utmost endeavor to avoid controverted points, especially when they did not bear on this particular measure. I tried to present the facts in regard to unemployment, in so far as it may be of interest in this measure. I have given the official declaration of the American Federation of Labor. I have indicated to you that another country has tried this out thoroughly since 1893 and has made an enormous success of it, Mr. Chairman, keeping unemployment down to the lowest possible limit.

Mr. SMITH. Has your organization taken any steps to ascertain the probable proportion of the soldiers who would want to take advantage of the law?

Mr. STERLING. We have not, Mr. Chairman. We felt that it was the proper thing to do to offer the opportunity to all. We felt that they were entitled to it for their service. You know probably, Mr. Chairman, or if you do not know, you had better ask Mr. Lane to give you the facts, as to how much better opportunities Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and England are giving to their returning soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. We have that in the record.

Mr. STERLING. I thought possibly you would have, so I did not allude to it before.

Mr. BARBOUR. The question has been raised here as to the extent to which the American Federation of Labor has indorsed this proposition.

Mr. STERLING. I have read you the indorsement.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is from the legislative program of reconstruction adopted by the American Federation of Labor. Was that indorsed by the general convention, or by different resolutions?

Mr. STERLING. This proposition, Mr. Chairman, as perhaps you will remember and as your committee knows, was brought in first in 1915 and applied to the soldiers when they returned, by the Department of Labor, and the suggestion in the bill at that time was that that project be handled by three Secretaries—of the Department of Labor, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture. Within the past year Secretary Lane, with his exuberant vigor, has assumed it all to his department, and as it came from the Labor Department originally it was a labor proposition, a labor suggestion, indorsed by the convention and urged for passage, before Mr. Lane and his bill were heard of.

I came here to urge the passage of Mr. Lane's bill, because we desire the thing, no matter who gets it through, or no matter who handles it after it is through. So I came to this committee to urge the passage of this present bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Have they taken action other than the paragraph read from the report?

Mr. STERLING. I was trying to answer almost that identical question to the gentleman. I said to the gentleman that this proposition as it is embodied in Mr. Lane's bill, with small variations, was embodied in a bill that was brought in at the suggestion of the Department of Labor in 1915, and at that time it was officially indorsed by the convention itself.

Mr. FERRIS. A concrete bill, was it, at that time?

Mr. STERLING. A concrete bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Tracking this scheme verily closely?

Mr. STERLING. With this identical proposition worked out, with small differences in detail only.

Mr. TILLMAN. We had not gotten in the war until 1917.

Mr. STERLING. Nevertheless that problem was brought in in that way. If the committee desires, Mr. Chairman, I can get you the number of the bill later on. It has passed out of my mind at the present time.

Mr. FERRIS. Was a written resolution passed at that time regarding the plan similar to this one?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Are those written resolutions available?

Mr. STERLING. Yes, sir; I have no doubt they are available.

Mr. FERRIS. Would you mind getting them and supplying them for the record as a part of your statement, so we will see just what action was taken?

Mr. STERLING. Concerning that bill, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. The bill at that time was general in its character and did not apply to returning soldiers exclusively, because we had not at that time entered the war and did not have any returning soldiers.

Mr. STERLING. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, other than the paragraph read, other than the recommendation in behalf of this general bill in 1915, you have taken no action that has been reduced to writing in a formal resolution?

Mr. STERLING. Not so far as I know. It could not very well come up at the last year's convention in June.

Mr. FERRIS. Was any action taken on the bill introduced by Mr. Taylor in the last session of Congress, covering Secretary Lane's plan?

Mr. STERLING. I was just saying I did not think it was possible to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think I have letters on that, which I have turned over to my successor, I think, from the American Federation of Labor, indorsing that bill—I mean, indorsing the policy. I was chairman of that committee. I think there is a world of that material there indorsing this measure, by not only the Federation itself, but by a great many subordinate labor organizations.

Mr. STERLING. There is an ocean of it. I understood his question to refer categorically to just what the convention itself had done. Am I right?

Mr. FERRIS. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. STERLING. I do not think the convention last year did anything at all about it, because in this present form it had just been introduced and had not been discussed, and did not come to their knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the bill that represents the view of the Department of Labor, known as the Crosser bill?

Mr. STERLING. That is one of them, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the bill representing the ideas of the Department of Labor?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. That was not confined to soldiers, at all.

Mr. STERLING. Last year Clyde Kelly brought in a bill which was supposed to represent the ideas of the Department of Labor at that time, and I was instructed to appear in favor of that bill, which I did.

Mr. FERRIS. Neither of those bills was confined to soldiers at that time?

Mr. STERLING. No; they were not.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it your opinion, now, Mr. Sterling, in the face of the large number of soldiers returning, that this bill should be a bill for soldiers, or a general bill?

Mr. STERLING. That is another embarrassing question. Mr. Chairman, in the ultimate, in the finality, this opportunity should apply to all the workers in the land at this moment. I am urging your committee to pass a bill through, having it apply only to returning soldiers. What the future will develop on that, Mr. Chairman, I have no idea whatsoever, and I would rather not complicate it with the advocacy of this bill at this time.

Mr. FERRIS. But would not the soldiers, by reason of their recent services, and such distinguished services, be entitled to a preference at this time?

Mr. STERLING. More than a preference, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERRIS. Are we not proceeding along the right lines to have this bill confined at this time to the soldiers and sailors?

Mr. STERLING. I would not want to say it quite so strongly as that.

Mr. FERRIS. How would you put it?

Mr. STERLING. I would put it as I did before, that I am here urging the passage of this bill, knowing that it applies only to the soldiers, and I am trying to avoid any discussion as to whether in the future it should be broadened out to apply to all workers.

Mr. MAYS. You would not tie up the land indefinitely if there were not soldiers enough to take it all?

Mr. STERLING. I do not quite see the bearing of your question.

Mr. MAYS. If you had the project and not enough soldiers applied for the land, would you then open it to other people?

Mr. STERLING. I should then come back to Congress and ask for further legislation, remembering this, Mr. Chairman, that its application as to all workers has been already construed by the various courts in the country, not only to State constitutions, but to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. FERRIS. You said a moment ago that your organization had made no effort to ascertain or take any sounding of opinion of the soldiers as to what percentage would take advantage of this?

Mr. STERLING. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Have you any opinion on the subject at all?

Mr. STERLING. My opinion is expressed in my remarks, that a minimum of 10 per cent would take advantage of it.

Mr. FERRIS. That would be how many soldiers?

Mr. STERLING. I understand that in the service, including soldiers, sailors, and all, there were over 4,000,000, so that you would have 400,000. Now, I say a minimum of 10 per cent. Secretary Lane gave you other figures the other day.

Mr. FERRIS. He gave 16 per cent. Has your organization made any estimate of what they think the Government ought to expend on each one of these proposed homesteads?

Mr. STERLING. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Did you hear Secretary Lane's statement the other day—about \$6,000?

Mr. STERLING. \$6,000 on each farm?

Mr. FERRIS. That was Secretary Lane's statement in regard to the amount that would be necessary to buy it and make it habitable.

Mr. STERLING. That sounds to me pretty high; but it is interesting to know that in Massachusetts—and I do not know about other States—but in Massachusetts the average value of each farm is almost exactly \$6,000. Those are the official figures.

Mr. FERRIS. Does that include the live stock and improvements, too?

Mr. STERLING. That is simply the farm as it stood. I judge it included the live stock also. I was astonished to learn that fact, and went over the figures, and went to the tax commissioner's office and also to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I was astonished to find that the value of each farm was \$6,000. I would have thought about \$3,500 or \$4,500.

Mr. RAKER. Are you familiar with the land-settlement act of Australia and its workings?

Mr. STERLING. I can not say that I am now, Mr. Congressman. I made a careful and exhaustive study of that question, but it has been about six years ago since I went over it, and because New Zealand was so striking it stayed in my mind.

Mr. RAKER. And the same would be true with reference to the California land settlement act—that you are not familiar with its provisions and workings?

Mr. STERLING. That was only a few years ago, and my only information is in listening to _____ in regard to that matter. That is the only source of information I have in regard to that matter. I have tried to keep track of it to that extent.

Mr. FERRIS. In regard to the state of mind of the ordinary soldier who has been employed at inside positions and has been employed in large cities, accustomed to city life, do you anticipate any dangers regarding the practicability of getting those men out on these farms?

Mr. STERLING. I anticipate that a few of them desire to get out of doors and get out of the shops. I know a great number of skilled mechanics who are getting high wages, who are longing, pining for the opportunity to get out of doors and live out of doors instead of living in shops between four walls.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it your thought that a large per cent of men who have been engaged in that sort of work and who even have longing to go on the farm would actually make a success of it?

Mr. STERLING. I should expect that some of them would get sick and tired after two or three years, but if that farm was so established and the man got sick and tired of it and went back to the city some-

body else would take his place, and so the relief would be just the same whether he stayed or did not stay.

Mr. FERRIS. It would at least result in the improvement of that particular area; it would increase the production at least, would it not?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. It could not result in a total failure, even though the man who now thought in his mind that he would like to get away from the crowded centers and go out there, became homesick, and went back; it would not be a total loss.

Mr. STERLING. That is the idea. The comment of the gentleman reminds me of another thing in regard to New Zealand that I would like to have in the record. In 1911, when that low unemployment percentage was made, they had a commission to examine into the increasing cost of living—if you believe me they had a commission to examine into the increasing cost of living when the increase was only 8 per cent, and at that same moment our increase was from 45 to 55 per cent, and since that it has gone up over 100 per cent, and it is a further fact that these people going out to these small places like that will keep down the increasing cost of living.

Mr. FERRIS. Did you hear Mr. Atkinson's statement here?

Mr. STERLING. I did not hear it; I read about it in the newspapers. I had a little comment to make on that subject, but I want to keep away from those things if I can and be just as good as I possibly can before the committee. I want the bill, Mr. Chairman, that is the idea.

The CHAIRMAN. For the benefit of the committee I want to state that the town in which I was born in Oregon had large railroad shops when they started to homestead that section of the country, and a great number of the homesteads were taken by the boiler makers, machinists, blacksmiths, and carpenters, and others working there in the shops.

Mr. STERLING. My belief is, speaking by and large, that those who will take advantage of this will be close to 10 per cent.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that those men made a success on the farm?

The CHAIRMAN. They were successful farmers, and their sons are to-day.

Mr. RAKER. I want to get that in the record so there will be no misunderstanding, that men of this kind can go on farms and make successful farmers.

Mr. STERLING. I think with the aid of the Government of the United States and the aid of books and experience they will sometimes make more successful farmers than some one who has been generations on the soil, who has only his experience.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. STERLING. I beg leave to thank the committee for their kind attention and courtesy, and I ask you for the bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much that it has not been possible for me to be in

attendance upon the hearings so that I might have heard the arguments that have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a mutual regret with all the members of the committee and yourself.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I did not think it would be necessary for me to appear before this committee to present views, as I understood them to be, from Colorado with reference to this measure. I felt that we were ably represented by two members on this committee, Mr. Vaile, representing the Denver district, and Mr. Taylor, one of the other districts of Colorado, but I was very glad of the invitation to appear before you and simply voice my sentiment with reference to the general provisions of this bill. I have been so very busy that I have not had time to take up the bill and analyze all its provisions, but I want to say that, in the general terms, I am in hearty sympathy with the general purposes of the bill.

It has been my privilege to hear on two occasions this matter very fully discussed by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane. I was deeply impressed by what he said of the necessity for something of this kind. I have long thought that the General Government, even before it was thought to be necessary to be taken up on account of furnishing homes to our returning soldiers, should take up some plan of this kind for the development of undeveloped portions of this country, as evidenced in certain States, from lands that could be reclaimed and made valuable by a system of drainage, other lands that could be reclaimed—among the best lands that we have in this country—by the induction of water drains. I have not had personal acquaintance with reference to the conditions that exist in the eastern part of the country, in the stump lands that have been cut over and the same kind of lands in the South, but I have always felt that the Government would be absolutely justified in loaning money to have these lands developed, which would come back to it finally in the full payment of the principal and the interest and the additional benefit of having brought under cultivation and improvement widely extended areas of our country that to-day are undeveloped.

I do not presume that this is any time that you want to consider special projects. I want to ask if the committee has information as to how many States have made appropriations through their legislatures, to supplement any action the Federal Government has taken? Do you know, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. We are having that prepared for the benefit of the committee, a statement of that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I think Colorado appropriated \$100,000, or more than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it is a sliding amount and that our legislature gave quite a large discretion to the governor or some commission to cooperate with the Government of the United States in whatever we did or wanted to do.

Mr. VAILE. I do not know the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in Secretary Lane's report.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I understood there had been an appropriation made by a great many of the States, and recently in Colorado I took the time to discuss this question with a great many people. I discussed it with the chambers of commerce and the boards of

trade in seven or eight different cities there and I found the general sentiment very much in favor of some method of this kind to provide homes for our returning soldiers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Timberlake, is there any sentiment in Colorado among the farmers that would be hostile to this legislation?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I did not find any.

Mr. ELSTON. You are a farmer yourself, Mr. Timberlake, are you not, or you are partly employed in farming?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. All of my interests in life are in agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Timberlake, there was some reference made the other day to the failure of irrigation in Colorado, and while this is not an irrigation bill, strictly speaking, you have had experience in irrigation in Colorado and know something about the success or failure of irrigation in that State. Can you briefly refer to that?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Well, irrigation in Colorado is a decided success. Since I have been residing there, which has been since 1885, I have seen it irrigated and reduced to a very successful agricultural State. I could best illustrate that possibly by recounting one project. In company with 20 others in my home town of Sterling, realizing that we had a stretch of country there which was table-land, as rich as any lands in any country, but which were uncertain for agriculture without water, we determined to bring water to them. There was no way to do this except by a ditch, taking the water from the South Platte ditch, 65 miles above, where these lands were located, and that water had to be brought through a ditch 65 miles long, as I said, running almost entirely through the sand hill country.

These men made their survey. The General Government, as possibly some of you gentlemen know, had sent their engineers into that territory to determine the feasibility of a Federal reclamation project. They spent a good deal of money and they spent a year's time with their engineers in surveying. They reported not feasible on account of the fact that this ditch was so long and had to be taken through the sand hill territory, and recommended against it, and the Government turned the project down. We had confidence that it was entirely feasible and were willing to spend our money in making surveys and getting the project started and it was taken up as a State proposition, plans formulated, and steps taken for its development. We sold $2\frac{1}{2}$ bonds and built our reservoir and ditch. To-day it is one of the brightest spots in Colorado. There are 80,000 acres that when brought under irrigation will be lands that will bring from \$150 to \$350 per acre. To-day, as for six years, there are 45,000 acres under irrigation, fully irrigated, producing the finest crops you ever saw alfalfa and of grains and within four years more all of this 80,000 acres will have been reclaimed. The project is an entire success.

Mr. VAILE. In reference to the failure of irrigation in Colorado, in Mr. Taylor's district, I think as he is here at the present time, possibly he can later tell us about abandoned farms there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who said anything about abandoned farms?

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Atkeson. I tried to defend that valley.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I know you are busy with this thing and have a great many here you want to hear. I did not propose to take the

time of the committee in going over the separate provisions of the bill.

Mr. VAILE. There are some I have noticed that ought to be considered, it seems to me, very carefully.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it your opinion that this bill will be accepted by the soldiers?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I saw a statement by a former Representative here that the soldiers do not care for any of this land or swamp land or some other land, and they were not looking for gratuities; they want to have an even chance. My understanding is that this bill is acceptable.

Mr. RAKER. Who made the statement; where did it come from?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr Lundeen, out at Arlington yesterday.

Mr. TAYLOR. I didn't catch that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. He said the soldiers in Minnesota didn't want any special privileges or gratuities; that he did not think any of them would avail themselves of the opportunity to get swamp lands or cut-over lands.

Mr. TAYLOR. The position of Colorado is that this great development is not only for the country, but it is proper also for the returning soldiers; it can be combined together. It is a great constructive measure, a humane measure, and beneficial to the returning soldier especially.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I can say that that is the view that I found.

Mr. TAYLOR. You were one of the Colorado homesteaders yourself?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I homesteaded in Colorado in 1885.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you not know anything about the farmers' views on this?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Wherever I went they favor it.

Mr. FERRIS. The American Federation of Labor—do you know what their attitude is in Colorado?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have heard that it was not very favorable, but personally I do not.

Mr. FERRIS. Their secretary came here to-day before you appeared, Mr. Sterling, and he thought they were pretty generally for it.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. He did. I understand the National Grange officers, the Grange, had appeared here and expressed opposition.

Mr. FERRIS. They did, but there have been others here who have expressed themselves favorably.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have a great many members of the Grange in my district. I talked with not only the officials, but I talked with many members, and I found no opposition, and so I questioned quite strongly the statement I heard here that the Grange organizations of the country opposed it.

Mr. FERRIS. Did you make any effort to sound the opinion of the returning soldiers on this particular project as to whether they favored it?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I haven't had much opportunity in that direction, but I was receiver of the Land Office of Sterling for 17 years, and by reason of that I have had a very voluminous correspondence from soldiers in Colorado with reference to what arrangements were going to be made that would make it possible for soldiers to get homesteads. I do not know how many, but I presume I have had

forty or fifty letters, to state it conservatively, from returning soldiers from my district that they have written with reference to this matter.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it favorable?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Entirely favorable, and very anxious to avail themselves of some proposition of that kind.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, so far as you know, the American Federation of Labor, the farmers' organizations, and the farmers themselves, and the returning soldiers, so far as they were from the State of Colorado, were all favorable?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And if there is any opposition to it, you know nothing about it?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. That is the fact. Now, gentlemen, that is all, unless there is some other question that anyone wants to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Timberlake. We thank you very much for your statement. We have Judge Richards, of Idaho, who will favor us with a statement at this time.

STATEMENT OF MR. J. H. RICHARDS, OF BOISE, IDAHO.

The CHAIRMAN. Please state your name, address, and occupation.

Mr. RICHARDS. J. H. Richards, Boise, Idaho; lawyer. I left Colorado in 1890, going there in 1879, the time that there was a great mining activity there, and from that time I have had quite a large part in the reclamation of such valleys as the Snake River in the State of Idaho.

When the reclamation act was passed, Mr. Newell and Mr. Bien, counsel for the bureau, came to me and said: "We have power to reclaim the West; we have neither money nor plans. We want your help." My practice along the line of reclamation had been quite extensive, because we had no defined law on irrigation when I went there, and we had to anticipate what the law should be. I have had quite an active part in establishing the irrigation laws as they stand in Idaho to-day. I said: "I will give you whatever time is necessary and pay my own expenses until you get organized, and then I will resign." I gave them six months and two weeks in preparing a form or plan of organization in the reclaiming of this valley now covered by this great Arrow Rock Dam—400,000 acres—and I went to every schoolhouse in that section over that whole project and arranged with the farmers and landowners to sign up and tie themselves to the Government of this Nation in helping to reclaim that great body of land. I, with their assistance, prepared plans and submitted them to Secretary Hitchcock, who was Secretary at that time, the plans that are still in vogue there. I tell you this to show my knowledge of the situation. About a year after, Mr. Bien came to my office and said: "I have good news for you. We have had plans submitted by every arid State, and the Secretary has adopted your plans without change. It will be the basis of the reclamation of the West." I said: "That is sufficient, and I will resign." "No; we want you to go down to the Secretary, to come East, to get \$300,000 to start the surveys;" and so I came on with Gov. Steunenberg. The result is that the great Snake River Valley is filled now largely with homes.

I talked with Mr. Calvin, the head of the Union Pacific, the day before yesterday, and he stated to me that the Short Line brought out of the Twin Falls project products of over \$40,000,000 in value last year. It was 14 years ago that this was started.

The CHAIRMAN. How does that compare with what was taken out prior?

Mr. RICHARDS. There was not a thing before but jack rabbits and coyotes. They took their pelts out and that was all there was. That whole Snake River project largely was sagebrush. My wife wept when she saw it to think I had taken her to such a desert. To-day it is one of the garden spots of this Nation. There is nothing more beautiful. I have seen wheat produced in the Twin Falls project last year 80 bushels to the acre. That is extreme. I have seen the farmers get for alfalfa \$15 a ton and 11 tons to the acre in one year. This is scientific farming.

What I like about this bill is this: When the Government passed an act to give pensions to our former soldiers of the rebellion, it seemed to me it was most depressing, because they went to our soldiers' homes and other places to wait to die. They were not living a life of activity. This bill gives to our soldiers something to live for. Remember that irrigation is scientific farming, absolutely. I do not care how rich the soldier is, the richer the better, because he can make a better farmer out of himself and a better stock grower by reason of that. If he is poor the Government can help him, and if he has any pluck, such as our soldiers indicate that they have, they will be successful, because every acre out there is capable of producing large quantities, and our farmers are prosperous. I do not find any attitude of the farmers that they do not want this act passed, but quite to the contrary. Our farmers in Twin Falls project, and you ought to see it, have got the best courthouse and best public-school building in the whole State of Idaho, and it is only 14 years old; paved streets and great business blocks. These men came from the Central West and have made successful farmers. The land to-day is selling from \$150 to \$350 per acre and it pays 10 per cent on that value. A man will study and learn how to scientifically farm, because the soil and sunshine are there, and water at the time and in the quantity needed makes farming scientific.

The CHAIRMAN. Were these men all experienced farmers?

Mr. RICHARDS. None of them. I should not say none, but a very large percentage of them were not. But they are experienced farmers now, and it would be worth your effort to come out and see what wonderful things they are doing. Our soldiers, as I watched them, are largely a class of men that have got energy and ambition, and out in that country if you give them the opportunity, rich or poor, they will make a success of it in a large percentage of cases, because they can not help it. We want to put the water and the land and the sunshine together with an intelligent man with them on these projects to show these beginners how to farm, and they can not fail if they have any energy at all. That great project under the Arrow Rock Dam—400,000 acres—just blossoms there to-day. It is becoming a great dairy and fruit country. It is remarkable—that dairying. The Carnation people there have special cars that go around the loop of interurban railroads and bring in milk to the condensing factory. It is making a dairy of that whole section. These

men are successful, and I say a large percentage, if you give them the opportunity, will be successful, because they could not help it. The spirit of it is to give the soldier something to live for rather than waiting to die. I do not like the pension system, but help a man to live, and don't encourage him to wait to die; and that is the kind of man we want in the western country. It will not take long to build that work and get them to working and in successful homes. I am down here now with men who are expecting in the near future to spend from fifty to one hundred million dollars on projects there, and I am here hoping that we can cooperate with the Government. We have so much water in the Snake River Valley—we have so much land—and with irrigation and water power, if you coordinate these things with the transportation companies, it will make that valley one of the most productive valleys in this Nation to-day. The increase in valuation and taxation in that valley is simply enormous—beyond anything I have ever seen before. Talk about the value being \$6,000 a farm—that is not a circumstance. You take a man with a farm of 80 acres or 100 acres, which is selling to-day for \$350 an acre; you can see what that means, and it pays the interest on that value. But it is scientific farming absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any opposition among the farmers there to the enlargement of these plans?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly not. We could bring them here unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any fear of added competition?

Mr. RICHARDS. Not in the slightest.

Mr. RAKER. I take it from your statement and your experience that it would be your view that in legislation of this character as applied to the soldiers, being that we are attempting legislation for them, that we treat the soldiers practically all the same and give every man who has a good character, which I assume they all have, the opportunity to get one of these places whether he has been a farmer or not.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is what I mean. This principle underlies our whole Government system, and that is the more men you place on homes of their own—I do not care how small it is if it is his home—he is an element of safety in this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. That is right.

Mr. RICHARDS. We find it true in the home-life building of these great reclaimed deserts: they are the healthiest, most wholesome, and most prosperous individuals we have, merchants not excepted. And the merchants and bankers have to succeed because these farmers are depositing money there to such an extent you would be astounded. They have beautiful automobiles, and have beautiful bungalows built on these farms. You would be surprised to go up there and see them. The farmers have beautiful lawns and flowers, such things as I did not see very often as I traveled here.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average size of the farm unit there?

Mr. RICHARDS. They vary, depending entirely upon the man's capacity financially, from 20 acres up to 1,200.

The CHAIRMAN. They make a living for a farmer on 20 acres?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly they do; and schoolhouses—churches and schoolhouses—are the first things they build; right out on the desert

a magnificent schoolhouse will come up right on the desert, and I think it is most wholesome, this legislation to give this thing to the soldiers who have offered a sacrifice on their part. If a man does not avail himself of it, it is his own fault.

Mr. RAKER. From your own experience of this and your observation, it would not be wise to fix a hard and fast rule whereby anyone could select these men? In other words, should not they be given some opportunity to use their own selection?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would simply offer the opportunity, giving them all the light you can. They will be sure to avail themselves of it as far as possible, and they will be furnished men to guide them how to be successful. We learned that from the Mormon people out in that country. Their bishops had charge. For instance, I used to wonder that they said they all voted one way; if you had the Mormon vote, you had everything. This is the situation in campaigning throughout that State that I found: A young couple from Sweden would be brought over. They would all get together and procure for them 160 acres. They would get a piece of land and select it for them. The neighbors would join and build a log hut or dig a hole in a bank for a home and give them a wagon, a couple of horses, and a milk cow, and the bishop would show them how to succeed. They paid their 10 per cent, and have succeeded in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Pay 10 per cent in tithes?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, sir. I have campaigned throughout all this country and have watched them succeed, and while they have paid that extra 10 per cent, or 100 per cent every 10 years, they have been prosperous, because they had business men to guide them; and we have taken advantage of that system in the reclamation district. I am not a Mormon, a long ways from it, but I had learned that lesson from that organization. They are successful people because they put business men over them to show them how, and that is what the reclamation is doing. We have skilled men. They have experimental farms and lectures by men who know what they are doing and how to do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it safe to say that this committee and Congress, every one from the arid States, would be practically unanimous for this bill?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. There would not be a dissenting vote from the irrigating States, would there?

Mr. RICHARDS. Colorado is my first adopted State. I went there in 1879, and most of these men I knew are not any more. I begin to feel I am one of the ancients when I get back to Denver. That whole western country can not be otherwise than in favor of it. It is its salvation. It puts the man on the farm for a home, and that is the best thing you can do for this country anywhere.

Mr. TAYLOR of Idaho. What is your native State?

Mr. RICHARDS. Ohio. I have had an active part in studying this question on the bench and with lawyers on both sides, and have had a large part in laying the foundation of the reclamation in Idaho. Everybody knows me from one end of the State to the other. I never wanted anything politically. I have worked for such men as Mr. Smith and Senator Borah to represent us. I want to help the State

into a proper home life, and everybody knows it from one end of the State to the other, and I am so glad that I happened to be here. I didn't think of talking to you any more than going to the moon until Mr. Smith asked me to do it. I am absolutely infatuated with this idea of giving these soldiers the chance, if he wants it, to avail himself, and we will make him succeed, if he comes out and takes the chance.

Mr. RAKER. If he gets discouraged, he can not help it.

Mr. RICHARDS. We will put him there with the machinery.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it your thought that a very large percentage of soldiers can be made to realize this?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Your returning soldiers, have you conversed with them?

Mr. RICHARDS. Lots of them.

Mr. FERRIS. Do they all like this?

Mr. RICHARDS. Practically all I have talked with. Mr. I. B. Perrine, here, is the father of the Twin Falls country. He knows that the soldier goes there and takes 100 acres of land, and in 14 years is rich, and has enough to take care of himself on that 100 acres of land, worth \$350 an acre, and it is there producing crops to-day. This soldier can not help but do it, and that is the reason we are here to get laws and see how we can cooperate in our undertaking. I mean coordinate transportation, power, and reclamation of that country and we will place men out there to guide these soldiers how to make themselves successful, if you will plant that there. That is what we want. They are good men, and we will make better men. If the Government does not do it, we are going to do it anyhow, because we can do it.

Mr. FERRIS. Could you take this condition: Take 10 men that have been raised in New York City or in Chicago up to the age of 40 years and lived there, living on a day's wages or salary, living under city conditions all their lives, and carry that proposition out; would it be sufficiently attractive to make them happy and contented and settle down?

Mr. RICHARDS. Any man who desires to better his condition and has this opportunity to come out there and do it and let us show him around there will be no difficulty.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you make your question, aged 30 years, it would be better.

Mr. FERRIS. Make it 25 or 30 years. I am for this legislation. Some very good people in Congress and others are of the opinion that this is a sort of Utopia that could never come true, and it will be very valuable to this record here and for the committee and the proponents of this legislation to have a man who knows what he is talking about touch upon these points, because these are points that require consideration.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have been in that kind of work ever since I went to Idaho. There is scarcely a place in the whole 400,000 acres that I have not been over and seen how they have progressed in the last 10, 15, or 20 years. They will come there and learn, and I presume some will fail—don't know how, haven't energy, and know too much—but if they will come there and learn, for instance, that too much water is worse than not enough, they can not fail to succeed.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. Is it not true that probably 50 per cent of the settlers on our reclamation projects, especially in the Twin Falls country, were formerly business or professional men or clerks from cities?

Mr. RICHARDS. In stores; druggists and merchants; everybody all over the Middle West.

Mr. FERRIS. What you said has application, of course; it is true that there are not arable lands enough to go very far for these 4,000,000 soldiers?

Mr. RICHARDS. We have a lot of cut-over land.

Mr. FERRIS. What can be done along that line?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have had figures on what it would cost to clear the stumpage.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course the unit of area would have to be much larger for the dry lands?

Mr. RICHARDS. You go up by Moscow and in that country and see what they can produce on cut-over land after it has been cleared.

Mr. FERRIS. You are speaking of Idaho conditions now, not any other State? You could not say that with reference to Colorado and California?

Mr. RICHARDS. When I went out to Mount Vernon and saw how your country here, between here and Mount Vernon, needed reclamation, I wondered you don't do something to reclaim the East.

Mr. FERRIS. There is not enough soil there to reclaim. They could get it all but the soil.

Mr. RICHARDS. That valley is beautiful. But it was like Colorado in the early days with no water; they told Gen. Sherman all they lacked was shade and water and he said that is all hell lacks. It is a good place to live in now, and I tell you that the Snake River Valley is a wonder for water power.

Mr. FERRIS. How many soldiers could you take care of in that valley?

Mr. RICHARDS. There are 2,000,000 acres.

Mr. FERRIS. Two million acres subject to reclamation?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. That is, that would take care of how many returning soldiers?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think you ought to average eighty to one hundred acres per man, possibly; I think a man can take care of 80 acres. It would be better if it was 40. I think 40 would be a better unit. He can make a fine living on 40.

Mr. FERRIS. That would take care of a comparatively small number. Are there very extensive areas that could take care of them at an equal cost?

Mr. RICHARDS. Not extensive, no. Our timberlands are largely at Boise and near there, where they are cutting about 800,000 feet a day. The land that they cut over is not subject to reclamation at all. In North Idaho it is subject to it.

Mr. FERRIS. In that section there is no water?

Mr. RICHARDS. They don't need water there; it rains there. Still in southern Idaho we have no rain to speak of from this time until Christmas.

Mr. FERRIS. It is irrigation or nothing at all.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are some dry farmers in American Falls there, but it is so uncertain. This plan that we are here upon now is the reclamation of dry farming country.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there water available for that?

Mr. RICHARDS. It will take dams to cover that.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think, Judge, you have considered or examined into the possibility of projects here in the East and North?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; I am not qualified to present anything worth while. I have seen your country from one end of the train and I am disappointed to see how these farms fail to produce. As a boy I thought Ohio was the greatest country in the world, but as I go back to the place where I lived as a youth, when I thought it raised great crops, I am disappointed.

Mr. BENHAM. Don't you recognize the difference between virgin soil and old soil?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been suggested to me that the putting of fertilizer on the soil in the East is logically the same as putting water on the lands in the West.

Mr. RICHARDS. If they would put \$50 of fertilizer to an acre in their lands you would have something. We pay \$100 an acre for water rights out there; we who put water on our land have got something. If you put fertilizer on here you would have something here. We have a billion tons of phosphate out in that State; that ought to be utilized by the Government and spread it over these farms in the East and West. It is lying there doing nobody any good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Secretary's investigation has disclosed innumerable projects in the South and also in the North and North-east.

Mr. RICHARDS. We want them reclaimed also. The West will be with you in the way of reclaiming and placing homes, either swamp or cut over lands or desert lands. We know what it means to this country. We are with you on the whole proposition all the time. I have given a large part of my life unselfishly to this matter and I think likely I know what I am talking about; outside of that I do not pretend to know.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further questioning of the Judge? We thank you very much. It is now 12 o'clock, gentlemen, and we will stand adjourned until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, June 2, 1919.)

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, June 2, 1919.

The committee this day met, Hon. N. J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will come to order. Mr. Vaile and Mr. Taylor had departmental calls this morning and they will be in later. We have with us this morning Gen. Cole, of Massachusetts, who will address the committee. Gentlemen, I will introduce to you Gen. Cole. I understand the general was in the first division to go over with the Regular Army. However, the general can explain his own biography better than I can in that connection. We will be pleased to hear from you, General. Will you state to the committee your name, address, and occupation?

STATEMENT OF GEN. CHARLES H. COLE, BOSTON, MASS.

Gen. COLE. My name is Charles H. Cole, and I was formerly brigadier general of the Twenty-sixth Division, not with the Regular Army, but the First National Guard Division to go over, not the regular service, and was formerly police commissioner and fire commissioner of the city of Boston, and adjutant general of the State of Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you an enlisted man, General?

Gen. COLE. I enlisted at the beginning of the war, because I was over age to get a commission that I might have been able to obtain. I spent a year and a half in France with my division, 16 months with the combat division, the Twenty-sixth, and seven months of that time on the firing line. My brigade was on the firing line, and I believe I was longer in command of troops actually on the firing line than any general officer in the Army. I simply state that, gentlemen, for the purpose of showing that perhaps I am as familiar with what the soldiers may need as any other officer of my rank.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in your own way, General, to take up this matter.

Gen. COLE. Gentlemen, I have read this bill, H. R. 487, and have talked it over with men in Massachusetts and men who are familiar with it. I am in favor of the bill. First, I speak as a citizen. I believe it is in line with the progressive legislation of the age; that it will tend to make the Nation a stronger Nation. The more we encourage agriculture and independent farming, the stronger the Nation will be in my opinion.

I have just come back from France, and, in my opinion, the farmers of France were what saved France. France is highly cul-

tivated agriculturally, and almost every foot of ground is taken, and during all my time and travel through France I have never seen but one field where there were weeds, to show you what scientific cultivation it has for a nation.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I was not in here when the general started. Whom does he represent or speak for?

The CHAIRMAN. This is Gen. Cole, who is representing the sentiment among the soldiers and the sentiment in Massachusetts.

Gen. COLE. From the soldiers' standpoint, I believe this bill will be a splendid thing for them. They have come back from France, after having been there a year and a half. During that time they have matured 20 years mentally. They have come back here and many of them are not now receiving their old jobs back again, and many of them have outgrown their old jobs. I realize that the State and cities of Massachusetts, and I speak particularly of Massachusetts, and the business men of Massachusetts are using all their agencies possible to place them back at work, but the fact still remains that they are not back and that there are many of them who are still out of work. They went to war with a spirit of intense patriotism. We have to be very careful that that spirit of intense patriotism is not turned into a spirit of intense pessimism.

I know my own feeling as I came back here. I went, for instance, the other day to call upon one of the richest men in Boston to ask him for a subscription to the Salvation Army fund. I was chairman of the committee for raising that fund. He said he was familiar with the work, but he could not give us any money. I said, "I ask you to give us a subscription simply to show your appreciation and your gratitude for what the Salvation Army did for the soldier over there." He then told me he thought he had made sacrifices enough; that with the income tax and what he had bought in Victory bonds, etc., he had made sacrifices enough. He was a man worth \$10,000,000, and I am a fairly conservative man; but I left that man with the feeling inside of me that perhaps it would have been better if none of us had ever gone over to fight for a man like that.

Mr. HERSMAN. Why did you not tell him something?

Gen. COLE. I ought to; I should have told him that, but I was interested in the Salvation Army fund, and I wanted to get money. When he talked about making sacrifices, if it had not been for the soldiers he would not have had any of his \$10,000,000. That was the feeling that I had.

I was on the end of a tram car a few days ago where there were two young men. One of them was a soldier, although I did not know he was a soldier until afterwards, as both of them were in civilian clothes. The young man who had stayed at home, through no fault of his own, perhaps, as he may not have been able to go, said to the soldier, "What are you doing now?" And the soldier had to reply that he was not doing anything; he did not have a job. I was in a Pullman car the other day and a man got in who I thought was a profiteer, as he got in at one of those ammunition places along there in Connecticut. I was busy reading, but there was a young ensign opposite me who was asleep on the arm of his chair. The other man brushed into him, not even excusing himself, and sat down.

and woke up the ensign without offering any excuse of any kind. That aroused the same feeling in me. I thought to myself, "Here you have stayed at home, you have been making all this money and you have not even got the courtesy to sit down carefully without waking up a soldier who has been over there fighting for you."

We do not want that kind of spirit in these men who come back. They are a splendid lot of fellows, and if the United States gives them the opportunity, they will be the finest citizens it has ever had. I do not believe in giving them a mere job, I do not want them to have political jobs, but this bill will give them a chance to become independent citizens, it will give them a chance and an opportunity to do something, and, in my opinion, it will be one of the very best possible things to keep these men from becoming dissatisfied and continual agitators, as they may be, and it is only human nature, and I believe we can avoid that if they are given an opportunity like this to go out and get places of their own and become independent citizens and move ahead and progress along the lines that they have seen over there. These men have grown tremendously in that time, they have really outgrown little jobs, and have been outdoors, and they do not want to go back into mills. They have been living out of doors for over a year and a half, and they want to be out of doors, they want to be out in the open air, they do not like to go back in the mills. In Massachusetts we had many men from the mills, and every time that they had the preference they would take an outdoor job, and this bill will give those men an ideal opportunity to take advantage of, and it is not giving them anything for nothing, but they are going ahead and getting a return for their energy and their intelligence and their ability.

I do not like to mention the word "Bolshevism," but there is the feeling among the soldiers, and it is only human nature, that they went over there and gave up their jobs, and have come back here, and many of them do not get them back again. Men who did not go over have been making high wages, have been making perhaps more than they did, and it is only human that they feel dissatisfied, they feel that their work and their sacrifices were not appreciated, and this bill, I think, is the only thing that I know of that will give them the opportunity that they need.

Mr. JOHNSON. General, have you heard many express the desire to go on farms?

Gen. COLE. In France almost all the officers I have talked with, and, of course, I did not talk with the men, as I did not have the opportunity over there, have said that after the war was over they wanted to get back and go on a farm and live. I have said so myself. French officers would say so almost universally. Now, how seriously they meant it at that time I do not know, but that is the general feeling, to get away and rest quietly, away from the turmoil.

Mr. SNELL. General, what is your experience, that these men are without jobs because they have developed so in the year and a half that they have been over in France that they want better jobs, or because people are not willing to take them back?

Gen. COLE. Partly that their places are filled.

Mr. SNELL. Right there, what I am especially interested in is whether you believe there are a good many places which are filled, and they are not willing to make some effort to take them back?

Gen. COLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNELL. You do?

Gen. COLE. Yes, sir. I did not think that was so, until I found out it was so.

Mr. SNELL. I am quite surprised to find that is so. I notice a great many advertisements in New York of large firms claiming that their jobs are ready for the soldiers on their return.

Gen. COLE. That is why I hesitated to say that, because so many firms have done that, but some of them have not. I know of a case of an officer in my command, who was a major in my machine gun battalion, who was in charge of the department store of the town he came from, and they told him when he went away that he would get his position back again, but when he came back, without any word or any chance or any time or question, he was not given his position back, but was thrown out and left on his uppers, so to speak.

Mr. SNELL. Would you not say that was the exception rather than the rule, General?

Gen. COLE. In that case I think it would be. I think they have done very well, but there are cases where they have not taken them back. I am not saying it with any idea of getting after the people, because financial conditions and different things enter into it, so it is very nearly impossible to give the man his job back. I am not saying it with any idea of getting after the employers, because sometimes they can not afford to do it themselves.

Mr. SNELL. On account of the conditions as they exist?

Gen. COLE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I presume the statement you made is true, that a large number of these boys have grown into manhood during these 18 months, and they really want and are capable of occupying better position than when they went over?

Gen. COLE. Take the boy who went over as a private, and then on account of his gallantry and courage is promoted. For instance, I know of one who was 24 years old last December, who enlisted as a private in this war, and was promoted and came back as a lieutenant colonel. His last three promotions were for gallantry and courage in action on the field of battle. I have several general field officers who are less than 24 or 25 years old. They have grown tremendously in that experience of a year and a half, and you do not want those boys to go back into 19, 20, and 21-year old boys' places. They ought to be given an opportunity, because it is going to help the country in the end to have men like that.

Mr. SNELL. Are those individual boys you speak of going on these farms, do you think?

Gen. COLE. Well, I can not say. One of them was a college student when he started. One of them that I know of is a farmer already. I do not know what the business of the other two is.

Mr. SMITH. We have a great many college students in the irrigated areas of Idaho who are making better farmers than some men who did not have a college education.

Gen. COLE. I do not know, because I did not happen to talk with them individually about this thing. That is the exceptional example, but there are many of them that went as privates and came back as sergeants, first sergeants, and lieutenants, who have handled from

25 to 100 or 200 men, and handled them through the acid test of war, and those men need bigger jobs than merely working in a mill.

The CHAIRMAN. General, could this plan be put in practical operation in the State of Massachusetts? Have you made any investigation of that?

Gen. COLE. I have made a thorough investigation, Mr. Chairman, and I am firmly of the opinion that it could be. I have for years, or for the last few years, been a very strong advocate of the revival of agriculture in Massachusetts, and I believe there are great opportunities there, because agriculture has declined tremendously in Massachusetts for the last 50 or 75 years. Farms to-day are not worth nearly as much as they were 50 or 75 or 100 years ago, and there are, I believe, many excellent opportunities in Massachusetts to develop a project such as is outlined here.

Mr. SNELL. Are there many abandoned farms in Massachusetts?

Gen. COLE. I will not say they are abandoned. There are abandoned farms there, but they are farms worth very little money, and might just as well be abandoned because they are not worked, and need money to be spent upon them, need something done in the way of roads, or in the way of putting the land in shape, or in the way of building the community. Some of them are so far away from anything that the people do not want to go there.

Mr. BARBOUR. What will have to be done, General, to put those lands in shape? I am asking that question for information.

Gen. COLE. I think there are several things. I would make it a community, for one thing; I would revive the land, for a second thing; and I would make roads. Of course, the markets in Massachusetts are very handy, very near.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you if, to your knowledge, there are enough of those abandoned farms contiguous to justify the organization of a community project in that State?

Gen. COLE. In Massachusetts?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Gen. COLE. I believe there are.

Mr. HERSMAN. How many soldiers have you talked with, General, along this line, and heard them express themselves indicating a desire and a willingness to go on farms along a scheme like this? Just in a general way, about how many have you heard express themselves?

Gen. COLE. I could not say. I never talked specifically on this thing.

Mr. HERSMAN. Quite a number?

Gen. COLE. I would say quite a number.

Mr. HERSMAN. Do they realize what it is to develop a farm under these conditions—to go in there and work for a number of years at day labor until they get money enough to pay on their farm, and then develop a farm as a farm has to be developed? Do they know what they have to go through—the courage and endurance that it will take to make a success of that—and the number of years it will take? Do you think they realize that?

Gen. COLE. Of course, that is a question I can not answer, whether they realize it or not; but in Massachusetts I do not think it will be so long a time. We could obtain some of this money from Massachusetts.

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask if you have had farm experience in your early life?

Gen. COLE. Slightly, when I was a boy, simply from choice.

Mr. GANDY. Did I understand you to say that some of these tracts that are not occupied in Massachusetts, are back off the railroad?

Gen. COLE. Yes; some of them are away from the railroad.

Mr. GANDY. How far?

Gen. COLE. Well, 10 or 15 miles. Some of them are not so far away from the railroad.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Could large bodies of land be secured in Massachusetts at reasonable prices for this project?

Gen. COLE. Yes, sir; I think they could.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. As large a body as half a township, a township, 25,000 acres, or 100,000 acres?

Gen. COLE. Some of our towns are larger than others, but I think it would be a very simple proposition to find land enough to establish one of these projects in Massachusetts, so that the cost of the land reclaimed would be no more in Massachusetts than it would be in the West, where they wanted water, or in the swamp lands, where they wanted drains.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. My thought was could they secure a large enough body of land in one body, I mean?

Gen. COLE. I think you could, sir. There is much more wild land in Massachusetts than you have any idea of. Nobody knew until they bought Camp Devens, which is one of the Army encampments there, that there was so much land there, and they have got a tremendous lot of land right there within 35 miles of the city of Boston. Down on the railroad, from Boston to Providence, there is a tremendous tract of land down there that is undeveloped. In the old days I think King Phillip had an Indian fight down there. There is a tremendous tract down there that could be reclaimed.

Mr. SNELL. How many acres are there in Camp Devins? Do you know, General?

Gen. COLE. I am not familiar with that. I was not there when it started.

Mr. SNELL. That is going to be kept as one of our permanent camps?

Gen. COLE. So the Chief of Staff told me; yes, sir.

Mr. SNELL. Is there not land enough in the vicinity of that if they do not need so many acres to be procured for one of these developments?

Gen. COLE. The Government is not going to buy a certain part of that land. It had a tremendous amount under option. It is not going to buy the part it leased for artillery purposes; that is the surrounding land, and that is a tremendous tract in itself, the surrounding land, but they are not going to take that.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, has anyone here brought out the fact about the number of acres which would be necessary to make one of these community settlements?

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to go into that with Director Davis.

Mr. SNELL. That has not been brought out yet?

The CHAIRMAN. Not specifically.

Mr. WHITE. Is this land you are speaking of covered by a growth of timber?

Gen. COLE. Partly so, and partly not covered.

Mr. WHITE. If it was made available for cultivation what would be required? Would not the timber have to be removed, and is it not stony to some extent?

Gen. COLE. This land that I speak of between Boston and Providence is more or less swampy and would have to be drained. The land that I speak of in the western part of the State is at present farming land, but poor farming land.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived in the State of Massachusetts?

Gen. COLE. Forty-six years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you traveled extensively through the rural sections of the State?

Gen. COLE. I was once a candidate for governor and as such traveled to pretty nearly all the cities and towns of the State.

Mr. SMITH. Did you have time when you were a candidate for governor to talk to the farmers, or to look at the farms?

Gen. COLE. I had to talk with farmers.

Mr. SNELL. That is the best way in the world to get acquainted in the rural sections.

Gen. COLE. I have been over the State in a horse and buggy when other people were running for governor, and have been over it an automobile when running for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. General, you went in the Army as a private, and you were promoted to a brigadier general. You may have some modesty about telling your story, but I think the committee would be interested in hearing the story of your promotion.

Gen. COLE. There was not anything particular to that, Mr. Chairman, excepting that I was promoted. I realize, of course, that I had been in the National Guard of Massachusetts for 25 years and had risen in there from a private up to adjutant general, so that it was probably my past experience, as much as anything else, that brought about the promotion. At the time that the war broke out I was a private citizen and was out of the National Guard, and the only way I could get back was to enlist as a private.

The CHAIRMAN. As a private did you not have an opportunity to hear the views of privates?

Gen. COLE. Well, I was a private over here in Massachusetts, and not over there.

Mr. SNELL. They were not discussing land matters very much then, were they?

Gen. COLE. I was not a private very long.

Mr. SNELL. I say they were not discussing land matters, either, at that time?

Gen. COLE. No, sir; not at that time.

Mr. SMITH. Your general impression, General, from your contact with the soldiers, is that a large proportion of them would like to avail themselves of the opportunity of getting land under this proposed legislation?

Gen. COLE. Yes, sir; those who are fit for such work and have an inclination for such work.

Mr. SMITH. Personally, while coming over on the boat recently, where there were about 12,000 soldiers, it seemed to be a subject for

discussion a great deal, and frequently they would come in groups up to my room and talk over the possibilities in the West. I thought the sentiment was pretty general among them that they wanted to take advantage of any law of this kind.

Gen. COLE. I believe that if this bill and its benefits were known publicly—I mean were given such publicity that all the soldiers would know about it as I know about it—that you would be surprised at the response that you would get from the soldiers, but there has been no publicity of this bill in our section of the country to speak of at all.

Mr. SNELL. Has there not been publicity to the general scheme of Secretary Lane?

Gen. COLE. Very little that reaches down to the soldiers. Of course, most of the soldiers were away when the publicity, if there was any, took place.

Mr. SNELL. There has been a lot of publicity work on this bill somewhere, an enormous amount. Mr. Lane says he sent out questionnaires and received 52,000 or a great many replies, so there has been an enormous amount of publicity work, I know.

Gen. COLE. It probably took place when most of the men were away in France.

Mr. SMITH. The boys in France seemed to know about it. I spoke with a number of them over there and they wanted to get a home under the proposed law.

Gen. COLE. In regard to publicity, the bill appeals to me so strongly that it seems to me that every man in public life, in our local legislatures, whether Democrat or Republican, would be advocating this bill at every opportunity he had. Well, I do not believe that they know about the bill, because anything in favor of the soldiers they advocate, and here is something that really gives an opportunity to the soldier, not giving him a \$100 bonus because he was in the war six months, but gives him a chance to be an independent citizen and to be of great service to his country, and a chance for himself to move along.

The CHAIRMAN. General, what effect do you think this bill will have on agricultural labor?

Gen. COLE. I can only speak for my section. I believe it will have a beneficial effect, because the more experience and more brains and more ability you get into the agricultural phase, the agricultural business, the better they will all be, and especially if you are going to have the Government help these men along, and going to have the Government back them to start with, and back them in the way of telling them what the latest things are. I believe in Massachusetts we need that. I am a believer in the agricultural possibilities of Massachusetts and of New England.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe this will have the effect of reducing the present supply of agricultural labor in your State, or increasing it?

Gen. COLE. I do not think so; I think it will increase it. I do not think those men would want to go to work at agricultural labor without a future, unless they had to, because agricultural labor will be, perhaps, more poorly paid in years to come than it is now, and I do not believe they would want to work at it unless they are forced to it, but they are willing to go in and do agricultural labor

at fair wages, provided they can see something ahead of them, a home ahead of them, and that is human nature. It is no different with soldiers than it is with anyone else, and I believe it will develop agriculture and modern, scientific agriculture in Massachusetts. We have been sending money out for years, investing in the apple orchards of Washington and Oregon, and I believe that the same amount of money spent in Massachusetts would have brought about as good a return, and we would have just as good apples as they have out in Washington and Oregon, and they have pretty good ones out there too.

MR. ELSTON. In California, also?

GEN. COLE. This money has gone more to Washington and Oregon, I think, than to California, but out there they do business scientifically, and with modern methods, and they do it on a large scale.

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you wish to add anything more, General?

GEN. COLE. Except the last thing that I wish strongly to bring to your attention again, Mr. Chairman, that if we do not want these soldiers to become bitter, we want to steer their present patriotism into the right channels, and this bill gives them that opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your statement, General.

Gentlemen, Mr. Wilson of Louisiana is here, and I understand has been selected by his State to make a statement before the committee. We will be pleased to hear you, Mr. Wilson.

STATEMENT OF HON. RILEY J. WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

MR. WILSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my delegation, on request of the chairman of the committee, requested me to appear before the committee and make a statement in relation to the plans under consideration for farm loans for our returning soldiers, with the understanding, of course, that they were not committed to a bill which I had introduced, or to any other bill pending before the committee.

I have thought a great deal about this question, and have read, I believe, and studied every bill and every plan that I could find dealing with it. There is, in my judgment, no difference of opinion as to the advisability and desirability of some legislation that would enable those of our returning soldiers who desire to do so to acquire and own farms and to engage in agricultural pursuit, and any plan that will enable them to do that and at the same time preserve the independent character of our citizenship, and not place any unnecessary burden upon the taxpayers of the country, I do not believe would meet with a dissenting voice.

I would like, if the committee wishes, to submit a bill which I have introduced, and the explanation of it that I have prepared and written.

MR. RAKER. What is the number of your bill, do you know?

MR. WILSON. H. R. 1254.

THE CHAIRMAN. Before what committee?

MR. WILSON. This is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee.

MR. ELSTON. It is your idea to put this in the record?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; to put it in the hearing with the statement that I have attached to it. It might take some little time to read and discuss it. I will just say in connection with it, of course, that if the committee likes, I can read the explanation I have prepared and put that in, instead of the statement I might make.

The CHAIRMAN. You might give a brief résumé of it, and without objection, if you desire, it may be incorporated in the record.

Mr. WILSON. I have written that résumé of the bill. I will say this, that after studying over all these plans, the impression that I wound up with was that the plan of Secretary Lane, which is embodied in the Mondell bill and a number of other bills—and I understand these hearings are primarily on the Mondell bill—

Mr. RAKER. It is covering all of them, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Covering all of them.

Mr. WILSON (continuing). Would not enable all the returning soldiers who might desire to do so to engage in agricultural pursuits, for the reason, as I understand it, that the only men who could receive the benefits of this measure would be those who would be willing to go into the soldier settlement or reservation or colony, whatever you might wish to call it. I believe it is true in my State as in all other States, that there are a great many who could not do this; who have attachments in the communities where they have been reared, from which they went into the war; left farms which they owned when they went into the war, or left lands which they might desire to go back and improve as a farm, and which they already own. There is nothing in this plan that would take care of that class of our soldiers, as I understand the measure, and I have studied it over pretty carefully. I would like to leave the idea with the committee that if there is some way of doing that, in my judgment it would improve this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON. I introduced a bill that tends to take care of that, in this, that there is a stipulation in the bill I introduced—I do not know whether it is in the room now or not—that where a soldier owns a farm valued at no more than a thousand dollars, this law will apply to him just the same as the one who did not own a farm at all.

Mr. WILSON. The Mondell bill?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, sir; we are considering all the bills. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we might take up all the bills.

Mr. WILSON. It might finally lead to some amendment to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have any suggestions, outside of the Mondell bill, or the other bills.

Mr. WILSON. I think I shall just submit this statement and let it go in, because the bill is simply an enlargement of the powers of the Farm Loan Board, and follows very much the idea of the Canadian plan, which makes an appropriation and places the administration of it under a board created by the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Your idea, Mr. Wilson, is to furnish some assistance to the soldier who wants a farm in a segregated community, apart from the Government community?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; in such place as he may choose for his home. May I read this, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (reading):

The bill if enacted into law will be administered by the Farm Loan Board through its present organization and machinery. The act therefore will not create any new offices or necessitate the employment of any additional agencies nor will it incur any additional expense for administrative purposes.

Under the farm loan act the amount loaned is limited to 50 per cent of the value of the land and 20 per cent of the value of the permanent insured improvements. This, of course, makes it necessary that those acquiring loans under this act must already have a substantial amount of capital either in land ownership or otherwise.

Now, under this bill a concession is made in favor of soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served in the war against Germany, by which loans may be made to them up to the amount of \$5,000 in any one case for the full valuation of the land or the land and permanent-insured improvements.

This loan may be used either to purchase the land or to provide buildings and other improvements thereon, or to purchase live stock or other equipments necessary to carry on the farming operations or to liquidate existing indebtedness. The loan may run for 40 years at 4 per cent interest.

For the first two years the payments may be deferred. This would give additional opportunity to place the land in productive shape.

These loans to returned soldiers will not depend upon securing funds by the sale of bonds issued against these mortgages but the appropriation will be made direct. In fact it is not contemplated or intended that there shall be any bonds issued against the mortgages given by the soldiers who take advantage of this act if the bill is passed.

Now, as to the number of returning soldiers who may desire to engage in farming and who will actually do so, except those who were already engaged in that pursuit before entering the military service, it is a very uncertain proposition.

My own experience has been that since the war was declared to be ended each soldier is anxious to return to his former business or occupation; the merchant to his store, the banker to his bank, the professional man to his calling, and the boy who went from the farm seeks to return to either lands owned by him or to assist his parents in caring for and developing the farm from which he went into the military service at the call of his country.

It is true, however, that many a returning soldier will be anxious to settle and improve a farm for his own home, and in many instances there will be those who have in view the lands they would like to purchase for the purpose of making a home and under the provisions of this bill the opportunity will be given and in such a way that the soldier may select his own land in the community and among the neighbors where he desires to live and improve and develop it in his own way, and have a home and farm according to his own plan.

One difficulty about the proposed Government farm settlement proposition is that after the Government takes charge of a tract of land, ditches and drains it, and divides it into farms from 20 to 40 acres, and then sells it to the soldier for the original land price, including the cost of reclamation and improvements, only those soldiers who can secure the benefit of this land are those who desire to go to the Government reservation wherever that may be. But it occurs to me that if we are going to give the soldiers a preference and some substantial assistance in becoming a home owner and a farmer, we ought to have a law that will enable each soldier to take advantage of its provisions at the place and in the community in which he desires to live.

Besides the soldier when he returns and enters civilian life is going to be just like the usual run of normal American citizens. He will desire to have his own way about the land he owns to bring into play his own initiative, industry, and enterprise in improving it and become somewhat an independent factor in the community where he chooses to live.

Under this proposed law no money will be used except that which goes to the benefit of the soldier upon his own application, and I believe all admit that at this time we should take some precautions to know that money is not going to be appropriated and expended except for necessary purposes.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Government will be taking practically no chances for loss, but may in a practical way add in a large degree to the number of independent-home owners, and be of material assistance to her patriotic and most deserving men who served in the military and naval forces of the present war.

I would like to add here the chief provisions of the Canadian act and an article which is published in the Literary Digest showing how that has worked out. The Canadian act, in substance, reads this way:

(1) The board may loan to a settler an amount not exceeding \$2,500 for any of the following purposes:

- (a) The acquiring of land for agricultural purposes.
- (b) The payment of incumbrances on lands used for agricultural purposes.
- (c) The improvement of agricultural land.
- (d) The erection of farm buildings.
- (e) The purchase of stock, machinery, and equipment.
- (f) Such other purposes as the board may approve.

(2) The money loaned shall be expended under the supervision of the board.

Reading this it occurred to me that \$2,500 is what they might loan, but I see the board has concluded that they might loan \$7,500. Of course, they have an advantage in Canada that we have not here; they have a large area of public agricultural land, and I understand that our public-land area that might be suitable to homestead is limited to about 16,000,000 acres. I do not know myself whether it is good for that purpose, but I would like to add to this a statement as to how this worked out in Canada. This will set forth all that I desire to say to the committee, except that my delegation are favorable to some plan for the assistance of the returning soldiers.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wilson, have you in your own mind figured out a plan whereby, under your scheme, it would be workable in loaning this money and taking care of it and taking care of the payment of the interest, and, supposing there are failures, taking back the land or selling it so the Government would not lose anything? Have you devised a system whereby you could work that out?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I have talked this bill over with the members of the Farm Loan Board, and they say it is entirely practical of administration under their present machinery, and that if Congress should see fit to enact it they would want to make it very definite that the Farm Loan Board was acting as the agency of the Government in administering the fund, so as to preclude any idea that any bonds were issued upon this, because when you loan up to 100 per cent of the value of the property, of course, that might affect the bond market.

The CHAIRMAN. Your idea is to extend through the farm-loan bank more liberal loans and terms to the soldier upon the segregated unit?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; to loan him up to 100 per cent. For instance, here are 80 acres of land that the soldier wants to buy, and it is worth \$3,000 or \$4,000. My idea is that this shall be appraised by the organization which the Farm Loan Board has in every community, and the money loaned the soldier through this fund to purchase this property, or if he already owns his home and returns to his farm from the Army, he could make this loan up to the full value of his property, for the purpose of supplying it with live stock or improvements.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your theory that we would get more on the farms and more improvements of the farms to allow this separate, individual selection than to take a large tract of land that is not being used at all but is valuable, if not more so than that which has been used, and develop it so that these men might get good homes?

Mr. WILSON. Do I think we would get more?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I am inclined to think so, Mr. Raker, and I am inclined to think more strongly this, that if you do the one thing, that is, take the reclamation project, that in addition to that you ought to provide some way for the man who wants to select his own home in the community where he desires to live, and to give him some opportunity or make some provision in his favor, as well as the man who might want to go onto this reclaimed project.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not your idea in regard to this legislation—at least it is mine—that the smaller tracts partly improved could be better left to individual effort and individual enterprise to subdivide and work out, and the man buy his place and improve it, and to leave these large tracts where they are practically unused and undeveloped to the larger development which could be done by the Government, whereby it would put the land under cultivation and at the same time give good homes to our returning soldiers? We would do a double benefit this way. We would improve these waste tracts and make them valuable, more so than if the person improved the land.

Mr. WILSON. Well, in my section of the country the large waste tracts are owned by former timber operators or concerns that are more able to go in and make these experiments for themselves and develop this land than the individual settler might be to take his segregated tract and improve it and make it a good farm.

Mr. RAKER. The purpose of this legislation is to take this kind of a tract and develop it. Supposing here are 100,000 or 200,000 acres of land that have not been used at all, that has the climate and good soil, and all it wants it to be drained or irrigated, as the case might be, and developed so that it will make improved farms.

Mr. WILSON. Take my section of the country. There is a vast—I will not say vast area in any one place, but there is a vast acreage of land that is highly fertile and needs no drainage, but all it needs to make a good farm is for a good farmer to go on it and develop it. It does not need any reclamation expenditure at all, and when these boys return to these communities and they want a farm, they would no doubt be willing to become farmers if they can acquire and improve this land.

Mr. RAKER. Is there a large quantity of that land that could be obtained at a reasonable price for a man to go on and improve it?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; but you would not find it probably in large bodies, but there is a large acreage uncultivated of very fine land.

I saw an instance of just what happened down in south Louisiana the other day, where two plantations amounting to 1,700 acres were taken up, and through the assistance of the Farm Loan Board, on a 50 per cent value, about 20 people who did not have any money, although, of course, they were already trained farmers, acquired homes there by cutting those plantations up and selling them out in tracts to these individual owners. Of course, that is very fine and very fertile land.

Now, it is a very serious proposition as to just how it is best to expend the money that you are going to give in order to assist the soldier to become a farmer. Under this Canadian act the soldier selects his own land, and it is shown there that about—I think it is

44 per cent of the returning soldiers desired to be farmers, which was rather astonishing to me, and when it was traced down it was found that 74 per cent of that 44 per cent had originally at some time been on a farm. He might have gone from the farm to be a clerk in a store before he went in the army, but that was rather astonishing, because I did not believe so many of them would seek to return to agricultural pursuits.

Mr. SMITH. Your bill, Mr. Wilson, is simply an amendment to the farm loan act, to extend the privileges to the soldiers, without requiring them to offer the same amount of security that would apply to an ordinary civilian?

Mr. WILSON. It does enlarge the powers of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. SMITH. You are not antagonistic to this plan; you simply want to supplement this bill?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know. That would be with the committee, as to whether they could supplement this plan, but I would like to have that idea carried into the legislation somewhere.

Mr. RAKER. It is not true, Mr. Wilson, in so many instances, and will it not be true also of the soldier, that where he makes his individual purchase, or tries to make his individual purchase, he will generally have to do it through a real estate agent, and he will make the price so high and desire to make such a profit that he will not be able to get hold of the land at a reasonable price by himself and handle it and farm it and make a profit out of it?

Mr. WILSON. This is an individual proposition, you know. He does not have to go to any real estate agent. I do not know whether you can just appreciate that in certain sections of the country an individual can go out and find land. They are continually coming into my district, and, for instance, from over in Mr. Johnson's State, in Mississippi. I do not know whether they come from his district or not, but I think I could probably go and locate a thousand within two or three parishes, as we call them in Louisiana, that have come over there and purchased land—80 or 100 acre tracts—and converted them into homes and farms, and there is plenty of that kind of property. Then, of course, I realize that in Louisiana, and probably in Mississippi, the time is coming, and has now arrived, when many large planting operations ought to be subdivided and sold to independent home owners.

Mr. GANDY. If both of these plans should be enacted into law they are not in anyway antagonistic?

Mr. WILSON. Absolutely not; but I do not believe a great many people will ever be satisfied, or that the soldiers will be satisfied with legislation that only furnishes an opportunity to those who desire to be colonized and placed in some Government reservation, probably far distant from their homes.

Mr. ELSTON. It will be in his own State probably.

Mr. WILSON. There are certain sections of the same State that there is absolutely as much difference between as there is between territories that are thousands of miles apart.

Mr. HERSHMAN. These two plans seem to be based on different theories, in so far as the Mondell bill provided there shall be a payment not only on the land of 5 per cent, but all advances of 40 per cent. Your proposition provides that the Government will advance 100 per cent on the land.

Mr. WILSON. Of the value of the security that he offers; yes.

Mr. HERSHMAN. Which do you think is wiser? Do you think it is wiser to advance 100 per cent?

Mr. WILSON. They exact 10 per cent in Canada, but if the soldier has not the 10 per cent, they arrange in some way to get him on the land anyway.

Mr. HERSHMAN. Do you not think a soldier that really is capable of making a success of a proposition like this, and especially one that is capable of making a success as a farmer, could secure on the maximum of \$5,000 which you suggest, \$250, or 5 per cent of it, so he could make that payment?

Mr. WILSON. If you thought it wiser to have him make a certain payment in advance, that would not be objectionable at all.

Mr. HERSHMAN. Don't you think that the soldier in the past year and a half has come to know how to take chances?

Mr. WILSON. My judgment is that they are going to come back here with a new spirit and feeling of self-reliance, and instead of becoming wards of the Government, the rest of us are going to have to take a new step to keep up with the soldier when he gets started.

I have no idea about the boys being in anyway unable to take care of themselves, and the 10 per cent payment or 5 per cent payment on the land in advance, which is being considered before this committee, might help it. I imagine, though, usually it is 10 per cent. I know that is the advance they get up in Canada.

Mr. HERSHMAN. It seems to me it would be a very-wise provision, because the man who can make a success of one of these enterprises can get that amount of money together in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. WILSON. This bill has had a good deal of publicity since I introduced it, and I have had a great many letters from prominent citizens indorsing the idea of it, and they would like to retain the soldier settler in the settlement or community in which he now lives. I know I would like to retain all those in my district that want to go into a farming operation, and I know we all feel that way about it.

I will publish in connection with my remarks the experience they have had in Canada, as it will not take very much space.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

TRANSFORMING FIGHTERS INTO FARMERS.

Almost 44 per cent of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, while still overseas, voted in favor of farming as a career after demobilization. It had been reported in some quarters that when the men actually were discharged the majority showed little inclination to farm, but the Saskatoon Phoenix points out that up to the end of February the soldier settlement board had approved loans amounting to \$1,668,105 to 1,218 returned men who had taken up homestead land. Provincial offices of the soldier settlement board, we are told, are receiving hundreds of new applications weekly, and the offices are working day and night to keep abreast of the demand for land loans. Far from being a failure, the Canadian Government's farm plan is declared by those who know the situation to be a pronounced success. Canada's reestablishment of her fighting men in civilian life by throwing open a career to them as farmers should have especial interest for Americans. Many of our own men are shaping their course toward the land, and the project of Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane has already been recorded in these pages. The Saskatoon Phoenix admits that not all the returned men who left the farm will go back to it. There are constant changes. The lure of the city is strong for many, and a war was not necessary to start a movement to the big towns and the

bright lights. What is important to notice, however, is that not only many farmers and farmers' sons who left the land to enlist are going back to it, but many others who had moved to the city before the war are taking this opportunity to get financial aid to buy land and farm equipment for themselves. Yet, the value of the scheme, the Phoenix goes on to say, depends not so much on the numbers who take up land as on the quality of the individual soldier settler. Supervision by experts and advisers of the board continues after the settler is on his farm, and every effort is exerted to see that he has the fullest opportunity to make good.

Of the 44 per cent of Canadian soldiers who expressed a desire to be farmers, we learn from the London Graphic, 74 per cent had had previous agricultural experience, although only about 40 per cent of these were actively engaged in farming at the time of enlistment. That the Canadian Government has gone about this enterprise thoroughly is evidenced by the fact that a number of training farms have been established in Great Britain, where the men receive instructions in farming under Canadian conditions. The courses here are designed to teach inexperienced men the everyday operations of the farm rather than the scientific principles underlying agriculture. In the Canadian provinces, moreover, classes have been opened at the convalescent homes to teach farming, and the Graphic tells us that the fields are the classrooms, and "to see a big thrasher or tractor halted midfield surrounded by an intent body of soldier students is a familiar sight in such localities." While the soldier has the right to select his own land, he has the advice of the best land experts in the Dominion in making his selection. The price is subject to the supervision of the soldier settlement board, and it is to be noted that in all cases, before the assistance of the board in the purchase can be obtained, the soldier must pass a qualification council which determines whether the applicant is reasonably certain to succeed as a farmer. We read then:

"The soldier is asked to pay 10 per cent of the purchase price in cash, this being a stake to keep him at his enterprise. Not more than \$4,500 must be left owing to the board at the time of the sale. Provision has been made, however, to cover the case of men who may not be able to pay the 10 per cent but who have had already successful farming experience in Canada. In these cases, either part or the whole of the 10 per cent may be dispensed with. The interest on the balance, repayable on the amortization plan by 25 annual installments, is 5 per cent.

"The Soldiers' Settlement Board is also given authority to provide the soldier with stock and implements up to the maximum value of \$2,000. Should a soldier possess stock and implements but no cash, this matter can be adjusted with the board. The money advanced for implements and stock is to be repayable in four annual installments, commencing in the third year, there being no interest charged thereon for the first two years. Further assistance may be given the settler by way of an advance up to \$1,000 for permanent improvements, including the value of building material supplied. This advance is repayable on the same terms as the balance owing on the land. As long as amounts owing to the Settlement Board remain unpaid the lands and goods supplied are protected from seizure to the prejudice of the board, and no sales or charges can be made without the consent of the board. The crops grown are also protected from seizure to the extent of the obligations due the board."

It is not intended by any means, we read further, to encourage the soldier-settler to take up more land than he can handle, nor to borrow up to the maximum except when it is evident that he can make good. When the soldier has purchased his land he will have the supervision and advice of a land administrator of long experience, whose chief object is to see that the overhead expenses are in proportion to the productive qualities of the land. The Graphic proceeds:

"Inexperienced men who wish to go on the land, but who are not judged by the board at present as a reasonable risk, will be offered two plans under which to qualify, the choice being optional. They may gain experience by working with successful farmers, or may take a course at some of the agricultural colleges. Care will be taken to place men who wish to learn on farms with progressive farmers who are prepared to render public-spirited service in this connection. A follow-up scheme is being inaugurated with the cooperation of provincial agricultural departments whereby men will be advised and instructed after they go on the land. Short local courses will be provided dealing with the more advanced phases of instruction. Under the soldiers' settlement scheme as now being carried into effect the soldiers will not be settled in separate com-

munities, but scattered throughout the province, wherever suitable land is found available, in settled communities close to railways, preferably in mixed farming districts."

The Toronto Globe informs us that the Soldiers' Settlement Board has taken "a very practical step" to enable soldiers to engage in farming, by arranging with a number of the leading agricultural implement firms in Canada to give soldier-settlers reduced prices on implements, wagons, harness, blankets, etc. It also proposes to make similar arrangements with other manufacturers and with second-hand dealers. From the Globe we learn further that the board has the power to advance to a soldier \$7,500 on the purchase of land, live stock, buildings, and equipment. In Manitoba by March 1, 1,216 men had been assisted with loans averaging \$1,400, making in the aggregate more than \$1,500,000. What farming opportunities are in Canada may be gathered from a statement of Sir Robert Borden, the Prime Minister, who calls Canada's "first great asset" her "enormous area of fertile land," of which only a fraction has been brought under cultivation, and he proceeds:

"During the past three years, under the stimulus of war conditions, the land under cultivated crops has been increased by 6,000,000 acres, and it is anticipated that this enlarged area will be maintained and advanced. Within the past four years the number of cattle in Canada has increased by more than 40 per cent, horses by 25 per cent, hogs by more than 20 per cent, and sheep by more than 40 per cent.

"Careful provision for the settlement on land of men who have served in the Canadian and Allied armies has been arranged by legislative enactment. The assistance proposed is of a liberal character, and the success which has attended the proposals in their early operation gives promise of excellent permanent results."

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR¹ P. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, I will introduce to you Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, who will make a statement.

MR. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Congress placed in the last sundry civil bill, which was approved on the 1st day of July, 1918, a paragraph providing for the appropriation of \$100,000 for the investigation by the Reclamation Service of the feasibility and cost of reclaiming lands needing drainage, and cut-over lands. In addition to that there was an appropriation in the regular reclamation appropriation of \$100,000 for the investigation of irrigation projects in the 17 western States. The latter is a part of the regular appropriation which has been made in small or similar amounts for some years, and the two together constituted a fund of \$200,000, available for expenditure in the country at large, one-half available for only 17 western States, and the other half of it available all over the country.

The investigation was organized in August with three districts. The 17 States enumerated in the reclamation law constituting one district was placed under the charge of the Chief of Construction, who had already charge of the reclamation work in the west, and the rest of the country was divided into two parts which you will readily recognize when I denominate them the north and the south, so that the north, south, and the west constitute the three districts known as such to every American. The western district was investigated by F. W. Hanna, and the southern by H. T. Cory.

Those appropriations are practically all expended. The irrigation work applying to the 17 western States has been in progress, as you know, for 17 years nearly, and the investigations have gone along somewhat ahead of the construction work, so that we now have the knowledge by which we can readily and quickly begin a

number of projects in that part of the country upon the availability of funds under House resolution 487, known as the Mondell bill.

In the north and the south the area to be covered and the small amount of the appropriation enabled us only to do reconnaissance work and find out where opportunities are, and some of the solutions concerning those opportunities. It was not feasible to carry on detailed investigation in all the States. We got into most of them, and of the States that we did enter we find possibilities in most of them, very attractive possibilities.

I can verify the statement made by Gen. Cole this morning regarding possibilities in Massachusetts. We there investigated only superficially, but sufficient to know there are several projects that under this bill would be attractive and feasible for colonization under the provisions of the bill. One of those projects is somewhere about 15,000 acres now in one ownership, that has been acquired by the purchase of small tracts by a company intending to carry out a colonization project, but they have been unable to finance it properly, and are willing to sell at about cost, which I understand averages about \$8 an acre. That is excellent land.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that project?

Mr. DAVIS. It is about 25 miles south of Boston, if I remember the distance, near Buzzards Bay. It is partially covered with brush, with practically no merchantable timber on it, and only a small part of it has been under cultivation. The merchantable timber has been cut away. A part of it, but not a large part, is swampy, but it will lend itself well to drainage. The topography is almost ideal. It is not perfectly smooth, but slightly rolling, and can be reduced to cultivation.

Mr. FERRIS. What would be the initial cost of a tract located as that is?

Mr. DAVIS. The initial cost, as I understand it, would be about \$8 an acre.

Mr. FERRIS. You say it is about 25 miles from Boston?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. What would be the cost of reclaiming it?

Mr. DAVIS. I believe it can be reclaimed at an average of probably \$50 per acre. It will require, as I say, some drainage and some leveling. Nearly all of it will require clearing, because there are old stumps, and the small stumps of the growing brush. The timber that is there would be valuable only for fuel and fences; it is not what is known as merchantable timber. There is another tract nearer Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the name of that tract you just referred to?

Mr. DAVIS. I know of no name for it. They may have given it some colony name that I do not know of.

There is another tract within about 12 miles of Boston containing between eight and nine thousand acres, that is swampy, but from reconnaissance examination I believe it feasible of reclamation, and will make an excellent trucking farm to be carried on by intensive cultivation for supplying the Boston market.

We saw an attractive looking tract in New Hampshire. There are others in western Massachusetts that we know less about, but reported favorably.

We know of an attractive tract in Pennsylvania, and quite a number in the State of New York: In Greene County, N. Y., there is a tract that I had better describe as being typical of others that can probably be found in other parts of the northeast, where the settlement is supposed to be rather dense.

Not far from Albany, in the Hudson Valley, is an area of eighteen or twenty thousand acres, already in farms, and with farm buildings. The farms are usually from 154 to 400 acres, and most of them are under cultivation but the majority are farmed by tenants. The great majority of the farms in the group I speak of are listed for sale, and I should say that the majority of the farms that are offered for sale could, at the time I look, last December, be purchased at less than the present value of the improvements.

MR. SMITH. Where are these lands?

MR. DAVIS. Greene County, N. Y. There are some farms in the group that are not for sale, and some of those that are listed for sale on which I think the price is higher than I would care to pay for this purpose, but a sufficient number could be obtained at a very low price to justify the establishment of a colony, in my opinion, unless they have been sold since I saw them.

MR. FERRIS. What is the reason for the excessive low price, that the land has been worn out and has to be revived by clover?

MR. DAVIS. To some extent that is the cause, but I think the probabilities are that to a greater extent the explanation given me is the correct one, and it looks like an anomaly when first stated, that is, that the region fell into practical neglect on account of its extreme prosperity. The farmers there with their families were so prosperous that they sent their children practically all to college, and in the college training they got they achieved a liking for city life, professional life, and qualified therefor, and went into such callings, leaving the old folks on the place, and some of them have followed the children to the city, and some of them have died, and others are still on the place and are homesick, but in the majority of cases the place drifted into the hands of tenants. If anybody knows what it is to live in the city and try to farm 100 miles away through a tenant, he knows it is not a paying proposition. The tenants neglect the farms.

MR. WHITE. What period in the past did those conditions obtain that you speak of?

MR. DAVIS. I do not know the exact period. I was told by a State official that that was the chief explanation, and occurred from 10 to 15 years ago, I take it, from the account I have. It is, however, an excellent farming region, as shown by the success of the farms there that are still farmed, and those that have been neglected, or need some building up. I think too, with some exceptions, there is some drainage needed, some of the natural drains should be opened up, but only a small per cent needs drainage. Some needs clearing, which has been neglected to some extent, and a portion of it has grown up to brush.

MR. FERRIS. How far is that from Albany?

MR. DAVIS. I think it will average about 25 miles. It stretches up and down the river valley for 8 or 10 miles.

MR. FERRIS. Is it bottom land?

MR. DAVIS. It is not the lowest land next to the river. It is back a short distance. There is a little ridge that runs between the river

and this land, although there is connection with the river bottom. There is a railroad right down through the tract.

Mr. RAKER. Would a question interrupt you right there? Before you get out of Boston, Mass., and New York, and New Hampshire land, would the size of those tracts enter into the question as to the overhead charges of taking hold of those and putting them in shape for resale or homestead by the beneficiaries of the proposed legislation? Would not the overhead charge be more than would justify the handling of this kind of tracts of land?

Mr. DAVIS. It would depend upon the size, and that is one of the chief reasons why we do not propose to take up single farms, but where a group can be obtained, reasonably contiguous so that they can be supervised together, and so that some system of cooperation can be carried out, that would have an influence in the economical handling of these farms and placing them in shape for the soldiers. The overhead charge would be, roughly, in inverse proportion to the size of the tract, and for that reason we consider it not economical to handle a tract less than sufficient to support about 100 families.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is this land on the west side of the Hudson?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. What size farms do you contemplate offering these Eastern States?

Mr. DAVIS. That will depend very much on circumstances, on the character of land, and location as to transportation, and the character of crops which it can grow. The small region of swamp land that I mentioned near Boston could probably be divided into tracts of 10 or 20 acres and used for trucking purposes, or a portion of it might. But the other tract in the same State would undoubtedly require larger acreages, and I think usually from 50 to 100 acres.

In the western part of Massachusetts, where some hilly land has been examined, probably tracts as high as 160 acres would be necessary, where 30 or 40 acres of excellent cultivated land could be gotten on the tract, and the rest of it put to grass, being somewhat hilly and rocky, but well adapted to grazing and even to meadow purposes in parts of it.

The examination extended into the Southern States, and we find there large opportunities in both swamp and cut-over lands, and in some cases where both drainage and clearing is necessary. The opportunities there are so wide and so well known that it is hardly necessary to go into an extended description, but they are in great variety, so that it will be advisable, in my opinion, to buy the tracts that can be most economically developed, and they are astonishingly cheap. Large areas that appeared to be attractive and have good transportation facilities, can be purchased at from four to ten dollars per acre. They need clearing, of course, and in some cases need drainage.

The Lake States provide vast opportunities, also Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and they are of similar character to those in the South. They are a division of swamp and cut-over lands. The area of both is very great, and the liberty of choice is very wide, and the acreage charge is very low, similar to that mentioned in the South.

We did not have an opportunity to examine in detail into the lands in the Mississippi Valley, but we have general information, obtained

by correspondence, and by talks with people who are acquainted with the conditions, and I feel confident that we can obtain attractive and feasible projects in all, or nearly all, of those States.

I omitted to mention that there are very attractive and very extensive opportunities in the State of Maine, and while we did not make a detailed examination there, we have sufficient information to know that the opportunities there are nearly as varied and extensive in proportion to area as they are in the South and in the Lake States.

Mr. RAKER. Before you leave the southern part of the country, did you make an investigation of the Virginia lands?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. What did you find there?

Mr. DAVIS. We find a great variety there. Along the coast there are immense areas that can be cleared and drained where they undoubtedly would be fertile. Further inland, in the Piedmont region, there are some regions similar to the ones I described in New York, that I think, for a first beginning, are probably more attractive for soldier settlement, that is places that have been in the past in a state of high cultivation, that were depopulated largely as the result of the Civil War, when many of the young soldiers went West and the old people drifted to town or died. There are many opportunities of that kind to-day in Virginia and Maryland. They all need clearing, because they have grown up to brush since they have been abandoned. Some have trees, 30 or 40 years old, on them, some of which would be available for paper pulp purposes, and a little of it might be rated as merchantable.

Mr. RAKER. Have you found this cut-over land, or land which was cultivated 40 or 60 years ago, in large enough tracts to make a project by the department feasible and economical?

Mr. DAVIS. We think so. There are not many tracts large enough in one ownership of that character of land as there are of swamp and cut-over lands on the coast, but there is one large tract of such land in one ownership in Maryland that is for sale, and can probably be purchased reasonably—I do not know exactly at what price, but the lands around I know are cheap, and in Virginia there are a sufficient number of contiguous tracts, which can be had at reasonable prices, to form a colony of, say, from eight to twenty thousand acres, which would be of sufficient size to locate a colony.

Mr. RAKER. Did you go into the question of the comparative expense of reclaiming that land in Virginia, south of Washington?

Mr. DAVIS. Compared with what?

Mr. RAKER. As to what it would reap in reward for the amount invested.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. Those tracts can be reclaimed more cheaply than the swamp and cut-over areas near the coast, because the timber is young and the stumps can be pulled more cheaply, and some of the timber can be used for fuel and pulp wood. We can only conclude what would be a reasonable price, but in order to get definite figures we would have to go into each individual tract in detail, and we have not done that sufficiently at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have heard Mr. Wilson's statement. What has been the result of your investigation in Louisiana?

Mr. DAVIS. Louisiana is the State that I should place second in the list of all those on the coast which have the most extensive opportunities. In Louisiana there are both swamp and cut-over lands. Undoubtedly there are some farms of the character of which Mr. Wilson speaks. It is very easy to find a large area in one ownership, or in two ownerships, where colonies of from 500 to 1,000 families can be located, with all the advantages needed for successful settlement. In some cases both drainage and clearing is required, and in other cases only clearing. The swamp lands are very extensive; some of the land is prairie land: most of it is timberland.

Mr. SMITH. Have you made any estimate of the cost of clearing cut-over land?

Mr. DAVIS. We have made numerous estimates and it runs through a very wide gamut, all the way from a trivial sum to total impracticability. As an extreme example, there are large areas of cut-over land in the Northwest, especially in the Puget Sound region, in western Oregon and in northwestern California, which is very good farm land. The merchantable timber has been taken off, but the great majority of it is infeasible for reclamation, costing as high as \$500 an acre, on account of the size and depth of the tree roots, and it would require a great deal of leveling. Altogether, they are areas that we know to be infeasible of reclamation on account of the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. If the cost is prohibitive you would not take up a project?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; if the cost is prohibitive, of course, we would not undertake it.

Mr. RAKER. What did you find in Michigan in the cut-over land?

Mr. DAVIS. There are vast areas that appear to be feasible in Michigan, and also in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Mr. RAKER. And it is good agricultural land when it is cleared?

Mr. DAVIS. A great deal of it is, and, of course, a great deal of it is not. There are vast areas in Michigan that are not tillable ground. There is a vast area of land that is too rolling and rough, and some of it with poor soil. In all cases there must be a careful examination as to what the result will be before the project is undertaken. There are plenty of those instances in the South and in New England, especially what we have heard of as the "abandoned farms" in New England. A great many of those farms should not have been attempted in the first place, because they were too rocky for successful agriculture. They were cultivated when they were virgin, and yielded something in agriculture, but their best use was for timber, and that is what they should be allowed to produce. That is also true in some cases in the South.

Mr. TILLMAN. You stated that Louisiana is the second State in opportunities. To what State do you accord primacy?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, I did not mean second best; I meant the second State in extensive opportunities. Florida would come first, and Louisiana second. The Northern States, too, have very large areas, far beyond the possibility and intent of this bill.

Mr. SUMMERS. What kind of subdivision would you make in southern Louisiana?

Mr. DAVIS. That would depend upon the location and character of the land. The swamp lands, mainly, are good agricultural lands,

good for sugar cane and corn. Devoted to that purpose, I should think the area would be 60 to 80 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. The term "swamp land" is a very elastic term. I wish you would give us some idea of the character of swamp land that the Government expects to reclaim.

Mr. DAVIS. The term "swamp land" is properly applied to lands that require drainage; most of them require clearing of timber, and where they require a good deal of cutting, better opportunities can be found in the neighborhood. But there are vast areas which are called swamp lands that are only swamp land part of the year. That is particularly true in the coastal plain in the South, in the Lake States, and in Maine. Those lands require drainage and are called swamp lands because the natural drainage system has been so filled with debris, soil and brush, that they do not drain readily, and the result is that in wet springs the land becomes covered with water. By utilizing natural drains, and in some cases by building local drains, that can be accomplished with comparative cheapness.

Then we have the proposition of clearing. The two terms "wet" and "cut-over" land are exceedingly comprehensive and elastic. We have cut-over land, for instance, in Maryland, where the land has been entirely denuded and cultivated for a generation, and then abandoned for various social or other reasons and allowed to grow up in timber that is now 40 or 50 years of age. Then we find land that has been cleared of merchantable timber, leaving only young brush and unmerchantable timber, which starts a vigorous growth immediately the land is cleared. That is the typical case of cut-over land. Every year the timber gets older and older, until eventually it will be merchantable timber. We find that in all stages of growth. The term "cut-over land" is indefinitely elastic, and therefore it is almost impossible to list the cut-over land. The same is true of the so-called "wet" lands. But in the most general use of the terms, the lists published in our annual report are the best that can be obtained. For example, in the State of Illinois, which is considered one of the States in which very little development of this kind is needed, there are about 700,000 acres of wet lands, lands that require drainage and protection of some kind. They are undeveloped lands and generally need clearing. Sometimes they are cultivated and raise good crops one year and the next year they fail because of excessive moisture.

I was raised in Illinois and I know that in wet springs the ground was in some places too wet to plow and we could not plant oats until June; we could put in a crop of corn in June and get a good crop. There were some places that were not cultivable at all but they were very few. We did not regard that as swamp country, and yet after I left there they drained that part of the country and increased the yield, cutting out the doubtful years, so that it now pays well. That is simply an illustration of the gradations of the term "swamp land" or "wet land."

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Are there any large tracts of unoccupied land in the irrigation projects now undeveloped?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. There is practically a million acres for which water could be made available.

The CHAIRMAN. In what projects are these tracts located?

Mr. DAVIS. They are located in most of the projects. Only a few of them are completed. Most of the projects have tracts that can be provided for in future appropriations.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Would the provisions of this bill apply to those tracts?

Mr. DAVIS. Only partly, because in most cases they are too intimately connected with lands that have been developed under totally different terms, where no interest was charged, etc. But where there is an independent tract of public land, or land that can be acquired at a reasonable rate, I see no reason why this law should not apply to the completion of an existing project.

Mr. SMITH. Some of these projects have been under construction for 10 years. I suppose the delay in completing them is on account of scarcity of funds and not on account of scarcity of labor.

Mr. DAVIS. It has not been on account of scarcity of men.

Mr. SMITH. If you should secure the necessary funds, would you estimate that it would take two or three years to complete the projects you have planned?

Mr. DAVIS. It would depend partly on how rapidly the funds were made available. As a rule, however, the projects in the East are much simpler than those in the West, because of the different character of reclamation work to be done, which may be carried on gradually and progressively or quickly and progressively, according to the plan. It would be infeasible, or impossible, economically, to carry out the work covered by this bill in less than five or six years. It would be impossible to expend the money economically in one or two years because it means the building up of an efficient organization, which no man on earth can do over night. It means finding efficient men, putting them in places where they are best fitted, and making an efficient organization, which we have been trying to do with the Army, and with the swiftness with which that was done there was necessarily a great amount of waste, without, of course, attaching blame to anyone. An efficient organization must be a growth, and in that respect the Reclamation Service is well equipped with a large organization which must be a nucleus to the organization we require.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you consider a wise expenditure for the first year, and for each year thereafter?

Mr. DAVIS. I have given some thought to that question and while I am not authorized to speak for the department, I do not think there would be much difference of opinion among those in authority. My idea was to have an appropriation of \$75,000,000 the first year, \$100,000,000 the second year, \$125,000,000 the third year, \$150,000,000 the fourth year, and \$50,000,000 the fifth year, to wind it up. That is a total of \$500,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not want all this money in a lump-sum appropriation the first year, would you?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it could not be wisely expended.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask you two hypothetical questions. First: Assuming that you acquired a tract in Louisiana, 100,000 acres of swamp and cut-over land needing draining and clearing, and under this bill you would drain and put that land in cultivation, tear out the stumps and trees, build the roads and drain them, and no

man would be able to select any tract of the land until you had finally computed the cost, or estimated so near to it that it would be approximately correct, and had some tract ready to enter.

Then, you would charge each man the proportion of the cost of his tract to the whole project, considering the most advantageous location of the ground. In other words, you would have to estimate in advance and would not know what it would cost him until it was finally disposed of. Would you be able to work that out successfully so as to give a reasonable price to the homesteader?

MR. DAVIS. I think it would be possible. Of course, it is possible to make mistakes, but we will try to avoid them. There are undoubtedly a great number of opportunities where that can be done.

MR. RAKER. Let us take an illustration close at home, where the facts are in my mind, and, I think, in yours; and I think it will apply to practically all Western States. In the Pitt River Valley there are 100,000 acres of land in private ownership and 100,000 acres of land in Government ownership. There is enough water to irrigate them all. Seventy-five thousand acres of private land is not irrigated because they can not get the water; still the owners try to farm it. Would this bill permit you to go in there and make contracts with those people so that you could dispose of the remaining public land and at the same time make an agreement with them whereby they would dispose of a part of their holdings to the Government, say one-half or three-fourths, depending on the amount they could cultivate, so that the project could be all taken up and worked, and then put men on this land in this settlement, so that the land would be really put under cultivation and used as it ought to be?

MR. DAVIS. With the proper local cooperation I think this bill would permit that scheme to be carried out.

MR. RAKER. The water is there and the climate is there, but the land can not be used unless a system is inaugurated somewhat as I have outlined. The Government started the project but did not complete it, because they did not have the money. The question in my mind is whether or not any of these bills are so drawn that you could go in there and take up these local tracts and make an agreement with the people so that the land will all be irrigated and they will pay their proportion the same as the man who takes up either the Government land or a part of Smith's land that you might sell to him. Do you think that could be made workable?

MR. DAVIS. Yes, sir; I think that will work.

MR. RAKER. Have you figured on that kind of scheme?

MR. DAVIS. We have had that proposition put up to us from your State, in the Honey Lake country.

MR. RAKER. Yes.

MR. DAVIS. I put a question of that kind to the people in there and they said that they would be perfectly willing to exchange all their holdings except 80 acres; but they were willing to exchange the rest of their land and they would charge the Government, for the part the Government took, only its present value, which would be a credit on the water right. I do not know whether that would be feasible or not.

MR. RAKER. Now, I want to get this clear. If the local units like those designated would cooperate and would surrender a sufficient

amount of land, leaving themselves only enough for a farm on which to make a living for their families, and the Government could take the balance and inaugurate a system to irrigate that land, both private ownership and public ownership, the project would be feasible so far as concerns a proper return for the money invested; the cost would not be exorbitant, railroad transportation would be sufficient, and soil and climatic conditions would be favorable. Your department would recognize that plan, and you believe that under this plan the project would be workable?

Mr. DAVIS. Some project of that kind probably could be carried out, but I wish to remind the gentleman, who is a lawyer and I am not, that that is a question of law, and whether or not this bill could provide for it, you can judge better than I.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to get the view of the department on that question, and I wish you and others would go into it, so that before we complete these hearings the bill can be drawn to cover that condition, because over half of our State is in private ownership and that land would come under the proposed plan.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the chairman have printed Secretary Lane's letter, plus any supplement you desire and plus the exhibits, so that we can have it to study and work on during the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

(Thereupon, at 12 noon, the committee adjourned to meet tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, June 3, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, I will introduce to you Mr. Hunter, the land agent for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, who has been interested in the matter of reclaiming farms. Mr. Hunter, will you give the stenographer your name, address, and occupation?

STATEMENT OF MR. H. F. HUNTER, CHICAGO, ILL., SUPERVISOR OF AGRICULTURE FOR THE CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL RAILROAD.

Mr. HUNTER. H. F. Hunter, Chicago, Ill., supervisor of agriculture for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad.

Now, gentlemen, I do not know why I was called down here unless it was to tell some experiences I have had in the last 30 years in selling ready-made farms. I have been in charge of the development of the new territory of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad for many years, and have helped to settle that country. I have been buying unimproved land, putting improvements on it, and turning it over to people to farm, in many cases without any money down at all. I have one small colony of Russians in North Dakota, on the Cannon Ball River, that I started five years ago. I have 100 people

there now, and they are all doing well and making their payments on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. What State did you say that was in?

Mr. HUNTER. That is in North Dakota. I have some in South Dakota, Montana, and Washington. I simply want to impress upon you, gentlemen, that this proposition of Secretary Lane is absolutely feasible. The Government can not lose any money if they will advance money to the man who is willing to work. I think this bill ought to carry a little more than \$1,200 as a first installment to help the settler, because at the present prices of machinery and live stock that will not be enough to give him a start. My experience is that a man should be put on sufficient land to work him to his full capacity. If you give him a small layout he does not have enough to keep him going, and he will not make a success of it, but if you give him a large enough acreage and enough horses and cattle to go ahead with it, if he sticks there, it is a cinch that he will make it pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the acreage would vary with the locality?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, certainly. In the Western States I suppose 40, 60, or 80 acres, where they are diversified, would be sufficient. There is no reason why the project could not be carried out in every State in the Union, provided you pick the men who want to go into those States. My experience has all been in the Northwest. Once in a while there is a short crop or a crop failure, and there is a clause in my contract with the settler whereby he does not turn anything over to me in that year. But in ordinary years he turns over half of the crop to me, and that pays the interest. I charge him 6 per cent on the land and 7 per cent on the live stock and the machinery I furnish. That fellow has got all the confidence of a train robber; he knows he has got a living anyhow. If he does have a short crop or a crop failure he is not going to lose anything. In other words, I regard him as a partner of mine in the enterprise. My experience is that these farms will pay better on a half-crop payment every year than on a 10-year annual payment plan.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres have you assisted in reclaiming?

Mr. HUNTER. We do not have to reclaim that land. It is dry farmed. Our wheat runs from 10 to 40 bushels per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not irrigated land?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; there is a lot of land in the Northwest that is not irrigated at all, but they have plenty of water.

Mr. SNELL. Is that land public land, private land, or what?

Mr. HUNTER. The land I am operating on is Indian land. The Government is selling a lot of heirship land in that country. First the Government appraises the land and then they advertise, and we bid on the land. There are millions of acres of land in that country just in that situation.

Mr. SNELL. What is the average price per acre at which you sell it?

Mr. HUNTER. It runs from \$15 to \$20 an acre.

Mr. SNELL. The Government has done practically nothing to the land before you buy it?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir. All I do is buy a piece of land, fence it, and put buildings on it. I have a standard building for different kinds of farms. I have one set of buildings for a large farm, and another

set for a small farm, and the overhead is not much greater on a large farm than on a small farm. That is why we can give the man plenty of credit in both cases.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of picking your men for these farms. Just what do you mean?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, it takes a pretty good man to be a farmer. I do not care whether a man has had any experience in farming or not. If he is a married man, a young fellow, and looks to me as if he will stick, I will give him a chance.

We have the county agents in that country. The agricultural colleges have them in nearly every county in North Dakota. The county agent will come down to these settlements and show the people how to carry on farming, going right into the field and showing them how to put in a crop. Where we vaccinate our cattle, once in a while the county agent will come down and the farmers will come in from 4 or 5 miles around, and he will show them how to vaccinate the cattle, explain to them why it should be done, and when they have had that lesson they will take better care of their stock. There is not much to vaccinate against there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think a plan of this kind would be feasible with the returning soldiers who have had no experience with farming?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; there is no doubt about it, and particularly right now. I have read a good deal in the newspapers about "community centers." Now, that is just what you want to keep away from. Any man who has not enough nerve to take his wife and kids out of the community to a farm several miles away and make a success of it ought to keep away from the farm. Our soldiers have seen enough of farming in moving pictures and Y. M. C. A. shows, and only about 20 per cent of the men will be failures and drop out of the game. But the land that they have taken will be worth more money when they leave it than when they took it up, and you can turn it over to some one else at an advanced price, if you want to. About 20 per cent of my people drop out of the farms, but in all my 30 years experience I have never taken back a farm of that kind but what I could sell it for more than the man was owing on it or what he had put into it. In fact, in every case I get the farm back with interest on it.

Mr. MAYS. Did you ever establish a community center in your operations?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; except I built a church for the Russian colonists.

Mr. MAYS. And did they go to the church?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, yes; they went to the church all right, but when I tried to put two families on one piece of land in every case they blew up. I tried it three times. For instance, I built a double house on a section of land and put two Russian families in the house, with separate barns, however, for their live stock, but in every case they could not get along and had a fight. That happened in three cases. Most of these men in North Dakota do not want to be near towns; they want to get back out of town, to keep the boys away from drugstores, and soft-drink counters, and pool halls. You will always find a bunch of loafers around a town hall. As I have

said, any soldier who has not nerve enough to go out 5 or 10 miles from town and start in on a farm ought not to be put on a farm. You get a little bunch around a community center and there will be a lot of loafing and too much theorizing, with the result that you will raise a nation of mollycoddles. You do not want to bring up a race of peasants like they have in some countries, where the family lives in one end of the house and the pig and cow in the other. You want to spread them out, and you will have to pick out strong, capable fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. For a community center they can go to town. If a town is needed it will grow up naturally.

Mr. HUNTER. It is nothing for a man to slip into his "Lizzie" and go 10 miles to a dance. They do not think anything of it. They have roads and, I think, moving pictures. They have two or three churches in town; they have dances every week; they have their lodges; and they have everything that anybody but a crank could want.

The CHAIRMAN. It really amounts to a community center?

Mr. HUNTER. Why, our town is a community center.

The CHAIRMAN. And they naturally grow up if the project justifies it?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir. Now, instead of having a whole lot of little towns with small merchants all together, doing a little business at small profit, we figure on putting our towns 10 miles apart along the railroad. That means better competition, better prices for farm produce, because a merchant can handle a larger business on less profit than the little fellow can. Now, the hardships of the country have gone. They have their telephone, their rural delivery, their daily paper, and their stage line. Some of my people live 7 miles or 8 miles from town, and ship a lot of cream to town. They have a little arrangement whereby one man takes the cream in this week, another man the next week, and another the next. There is no such thing as lonesomeness in farm life there. It is a myth, and the theorists that write about it do not know anything about it. You go there and you will see a moving picture of farm life in actual life, and any man who claims there is lonesomeness on farms has no business being on a farm.

Mr. GANDY. Now, the fact that you sell land to the man on the crop-payment plan is evidence to the man who goes on it that you have confidence in the land, is it not?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely.

Mr. GANDY. That starts him out with confidence?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. Taking your general experience in the Northwest, North and South Dakota and adjoining States, has it or has it not been your experience that the man who actually stayed with his farm, even through more or less adversity to start with, has made a success of it in the end?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely. I settled the Jim River Valley in North Dakota in 1892, when we had to twist hay and burn it in the stove. During those hard times wheat was selling at 50 cents a bushel. A man wanted to buy a farm and did not have the money to put down. I turned over to him a quarter section and said: "Put it under cultivation, and when you raise your crop, give me 3,000 bushels of

wheat." He took the land and farmed it, and turned over to me 3,000 bushels of wheat. Last year I got 75 cents a bushel for it instead of 50 cents, and you could not buy that land to-day for \$125 an acre. That shows that while settlement does not increase the rainfall, it tends to conserve moisture.

Mr. GANDY. You speak of heirship land. Practically every reservation in the Northwest has from a score to a hundred acres of what we call heirship land.

Mr. HUNTER. There is a great deal of heirship land. There are a lot of Indians who are rich enough in land, but they do not get enough to eat. For instance, a buck has 640 acres, and his squaw has 320 acres, and they have not enough to eat. If he would sell a quarter section he would have enough to live on as long as he lives, and be well cared for and happy, but instead of doing that, he holds on to his land and gets hungry.

Mr. MAYS. You purchase that tract of land from the Indian and sell it to the settler?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; I purchase the land from the Government.

Mr. MAYS. As a representative of the railroad company?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; personally. The railroad has no funds for that purpose. It does not take much of my own time; I have a man to look after the business. Now, the State of South Dakota, at the last session of the State legislature, appropriated \$1,000,000 to aid soldiers in getting settled on farms. I believe some provision ought to be made in this bill to allow the Secretary of the Interior to work with the States who have already made this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. There is such a provision in the bill.

Mr. HUNTER. The State of South Dakota proposes to work out the plan in this way: They will take over State land or buy up Indian land, put improvements on it and sell it to the settler. Then their rural credits department will advance the settler 70 per cent of what this proposition has cost. Of course, the rural-credits system in South Dakota is not big enough to handle it on a very large scale. Now, if this Government will do what the Canadian Government does—if the State will develop the land and put the settler on it, then the Government ought to absorb 70 per cent of the cost, taking the settler's bonds for 70 per cent of the cost, and in many cases the State will get 30 per cent of the cash out of the land to start with. With the help of the Government South Dakota could handle a hundred million dollar deal.

Mr. BENHAM. Is it the policy of the State to colonize the soldiers, or would it allow the soldier to select his home community?

Mr. HUNTER. I think they should do both. I think it is a wise thing to allow the soldier to select the place where he wants to go, provided the land can be bought at a reasonable price. There ought to be a provision in this bill whereby a man can get a farm in New England or in Montana, or in the South.

Mr. BENHAM. This bill provides for a sort of colonization plan; that is, to settle them in soldier colonies. Now, is that a requirement of your South Dakota law?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; not as I understand it.

Mr. SNELL. Do you think that we should require cooperation on the part of each individual State where these activities are started, or that the Federal Government should do it all?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I think the States ought to be asked to help. I think you would make a better success of it if the different States would help.

Mr. SNELL. And make that a requirement of the legislation?

Mr. HUNTER. I would not be prepared to say. I had not thought much about that, but under some of the State constitutions they can do that.

Mr. SNELL. But you are firmly convinced that it is more likely to be a success if the legal authorities have a definite positive interest in the money expended?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any observations in the Eastern States to determine whether or not this plan would be feasible?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I was born and brought up in eastern Canada and have been in this country 36 or 37 years. I go through the Eastern States very often. There is no reason why any of these old farms could not be rehabilitated, and that can be done if you put a young man on a farm who has the ability to make good. Of course, he would have to use fertilizer in that part of the country, whereas you gentlemen of the West use water. That is the only difference. The Government will make a much greater success of this proposition if they will let the soldier designate practically where he wants to go, because I do not think a northern man would want to go South, and a southern man would not want to go North.

Mr. ELSTON. I suppose nearly every State has a project. Would you say that the State should specify the conditions or would you say that the soldier should be allowed to choose the particular farm in the particular State?

Mr. HUNTER. He could not do that, but he could choose the State.

Mr. ELSTON. And if there is a community project in that State that the Government is developing, you would say that he could locate in that State and on that Government project?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. If you are in a locality where you must have a project, by reason of drainage, by reason of irrigation, or by reason of pulling stumps, then the project, so termed, would be all right; and if you are in a locality where nothing is needed except the construction of buildings, putting up fences and digging wells, would a so-called project be necessary?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. It has been suggested that a man would get more assistance in a project where there could be cooperative work—that is, where the project would be large enough to have a common tractor for service among the various farmers, and where they could afford to employ an expert to supervise the work. Now, that could be done better on a project than on isolated farms scattered 25 or 30 miles apart, could it not?

Mr. HUNTER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ELSTON. And do you not think it could be developed by drainage, etc., and then sold to the soldier at a cheaper price on the whole, on the average, than you could sell to the soldier an isolated farm in a particular spot that he could choose? In other words, a wholesale transaction can be carried out more cheaply than a retail transaction?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; it could be done on a cut-over land, drainage, or irrigation project.

Mr. BENHAM. Would you assume that the Government would do this work more cheaply or more efficiently than private enterprise?

Mr. HUNTER. I do not assume so; it can be done.

Mr. SNELL. I come from New York State, and in northern New York and in New England there are a great many farms of from 100 to 140 acres, around in that vicinity, where the land is all right and has been tilled, but it has run out. Those farms can be bought to-day for less than the cost of the buildings. What do you think of the project of the Government buying those farms and letting individual men go and select them, taking men from New York State and letting them select these farms?

Mr. HUNTER. That is just the way the Government should handle these farms. They ought to pick them up and have their experts tell what is necessary to bring them back to life.

Mr. SNELL. We have our agricultural agents in every county in the New England States, and that is what they are doing in New York.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; and the agricultural department of New York, together with the railroads of New York, are reclaiming that land.

Mr. SNELL. The trouble is that the farms are owned by men who are past the time of life when they can take care of the land; they have no young help to take care of the farms.

Mr. HUNTER. That is true, and if the Government or the State would step in to-day they could buy them for less than they are worth.

Mr. SNELL. Well, at any rate, they could buy them for less than it would cost to construct the buildings?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; and the sooner that is done the sooner that evil will be remedied.

Mr. GANDY. Let us go back to the Indian proposition. These Indian lands sell for very close to the appraisement, do they not?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. Realizing that that is true, and the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction, would it not be a benefit to any Indian reservation in the country if you took enough of this tribal or heirship land that they are going to sell to make a good farm and turned it over to a project of this kind at the appraised price, and let it be developed, and in the end would not the reservation be the gainer, due to the fact that the value of the remaining lands would be thereby increased?

Mr. HUNTER. It would more than double the value of the land. An Indian could even afford to give away half of his land in order to increase the value of the remainder.

Mr. GANDY. Take either the Cheyenne or Standing Rock country, as a rough guess. How many quarter sections of heirship land would you say are available on either one of those reservations?

Mr. HUNTER. You could take up 50,000 acres easily on either one of them. More than 3,000,000 acres on the Standing Rock Reservation have been leased for grazing this year.

Mr. SNELL. I wish you would explain what is meant by "heirship land."

Mr. HUNTER. It is Indian land.

Mr. ELSTON. It has nothing to do with airplanes?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir. It is land that has fallen to the Indians by inheritance.

Mr. GANDY. It is land that has passed through the heirship division of the Indian Office, which is somewhat like your probate court in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. It is inherited land?

Mr. GANDY. Yes; inherited land.

Mr. HUNTER. When the Government allotted the land to the Indians it gave the buck 640 acres and the squaw 320 acres and the children got 160 acres, and that is called heirship land. When they died off, instead of the title being adjudicated by the county courts, or probate courts, the Government determined the heirs of those people and then issued deeds to whoever bought it.

Mr. VAILE. The Government gives an administrator's deed.

Mr. BARBOUR. We have some land in my part of the country that takes an airplane to get at, and I thought may be that was the same kind.

Mr. HUNTER. Where are you from?

Mr. BARBOUR. California.

Mr. HUNTER. You have a State project that has worked out very successfully.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; it has.

Mr. SMITH. I presume that the reason of your being so successful in your operations is that you take a great deal of care in selecting the men to whom you make these advances. Is that true? In other words, you ascertain in advance whether they are reliable, honest, and industrious?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; I generally just look at them between the eyes.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think it would be wise to embody in this legislation a provision that these selections should be made through the Secretary of the Interior, first ascertaining whether the man is reliable and industrious before the money is advanced?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, there ought not to be too much red tape. In the first place, every soldier ought to be able to pay a small amount of money down, either himself or through his relatives. If a man has only \$500, and you let him put that down and advance him some credit, you can hold him just as well as the big man who has a large investment. And you want to avoid the idea that the Government is going to do something for these people for nothing. I have had as many as a hundred inquiries from all over the country along that line. I had one from a man in Montana who said he heard the Government was going to stake him to a farm, and he said all he had was two pet goats and he wanted to know whether the Government would let him take them along. The Government will have thousands of inquiries just like that, with nothing in them. My idea is that wherever you open a project in a State, soldiers who want to go to that State ought to be referred to that project, and let the State select the men. Now, you will have to give them all a chance, and you are not taking any chances when you put men on the land, because every day's work applied intelligently increases the value

of the farm. The Government can not lose any money on these projects unless they are overofficered.

Mr. GANDY. In the last few months how many cars of immigrants' goods have you handled?

Mr. HUNTER. On our branch line in Dakota we had 260 cars in February, 390 cars in March, 296 cars in April, and I have not received the figures for May. That is only for immigrants' movables, averaging three families to a car.

Mr. SNELL. That means people going from the city to the country?

Mr. HUNTER. It means renters going out from the city to the country. You understand that for 50 years the only organized opportunity to bring people back to the farms was the railroad, and when we entered the war the Government took over the railroads, but we have still carried on our advertising. The year before the war I moved 6,600 people through our gates to the lands on the extension line.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the objections urged against this bill is that it will decrease the supply of farm labor.

Mr. HUNTER. Decrease it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Where do they get that idea?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been urged before the committee that at the present time there is a scarcity of farm labor.

Mr. HUNTER. It will increase your farm labor. The more people you put in the country the more you increase your farm labor.

Mr. BENHAM. Will this colonization scheme have that effect upon a part of the country where there is no such colonization? For instance, in my district I do not think there will be a colonization scheme, and I anticipate that the very best returning soldiers in that community will need Government aid. Will they stay on the farms where they are and do without Government help, or will they go to other communities?

Mr. HUNTER. Would the soldier be there as a farm laborer now?

Mr. BENHAM. They are there as farm laborers, or as part owners of farms.

Mr. HUNTER. What State are you from?

Mr. BENHAM. Indiana.

Mr. HUNTER. We have a large immigration from Indiana. If there is a soldier in Indiana now who is a farm laborer and willing to go West and accept Government credit, you ought to be glad to let him go.

Mr. BENHAM. But the point is: What is the effect upon our community of the going away of the best men in the community?

Mr. HUNTER. It will never be noticeable. In the territory where I operate the young men are growing up so fast that we do not find much shortage of farm labor because the farmers bunch together and get their work done.

Mr. BENHAM. We have been speaking of the large number of practically abandoned farms in New England. What is the cause of that?

Mr. HUNTER. I think the greatest cause of it is that people have grown old, the soil has worn out, and they can not compete with the West in raising grain and hay.

Mr. BENHAM. And the younger men have gone West?

Mr. HUNTER. The younger men have gone West and made good. There is one thing that is going to help the East and that is the higher freight rates on grain and live stock.

Mr. BENHAM. In short, is not the condition pictured in New York equally true of the Central West: That the cheapness and fertility of the soil of the Middle West has tended to cause the farms in the older States to be abandoned?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; I do not think that has caused it. I think it is the cheapness with which we carry on farming in the West that has brought about that condition.

Mr. VAILE. It is farming on a larger scale in the West?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; farming on a larger scale, and the low freight rates that we used to have years ago put the eastern fellow out of business, but that ought not to be so any more, because the eastern man ought to get more for his grain.

Mr. MAYS. Are the rates going to continue to get higher in the West?

Mr. HUNTER. I think they will, unless you want to make an indirect tax on the people to keep the wages up. I do not think the United States will have to contend with the cheap labor of Europe from now on, and I believe we are going to eat more beef and grain, and I think the farmers are going to have a more prosperous time. The farmers of the Middle West are wearing silk shirts and underwear.

What I want to impress upon the committee is that if the Government will lend aid to these returning soldiers there is no chance of losing a dollar of the money invested, and it will build up a country where the farmers are not Bolsheviks or Socialists, where they have all got something, where they are all farm owners, and where they will be men among men.

Mr. Chairman, I start out my advertising saying: "Own your own home. Be a prosperous, loyal American citizen. Give your family a chance. Keep out of the crowded cities. Be an empire builder. Work for yourself instead of the other fellow." Now, when we hand them that and get the right fellows, and when I take a fellow out and show him a farm with the buildings and the well, the back kitchen, and the pasture fence, and hand the wife the key and say: "Do you want it?" they all grab it. Now, if I can do that in a small way with a few hundred thousand dollars invested, what could the Government do? We are the greatest Nation to-day, but we could make it doubly great, I am sure.

Mr. NICHOLS. What railroad are you connected with?

Mr. HUNTER. The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.

Mr. NICHOLS. Your activities in this farm settlement proposition are a personal enterprise with you, are they not?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; and I have some friends in it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you restrict the settlement of farms to soldiers?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, no; never.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you consider it a good proposition, aside from the point of helping the soldier?

Mr. HUNTER. Why, certainly. I think this bill should contain a provision whereby it would give the soldier the first right, and afterward apply it to any citizen who desires to take up a farm. I say

that for this reason : That you are not going to get as many soldiers as you figure for, and the idea ought to be to get everybody back on the farm. That is my idea.

MR. RAKER. If you put them all back on the farm you will have nobody in the cities.

MR. HUNTER. Well, put back enough to balance the country evenly with the city. If you do not do that you are going to have industrial trouble in this country, and bad trouble at that. Unless you reduce the cost of production, the prices are going to be so high that the laboring man will not get enough to eat.

MR. RAKER. What are you going to do if you reduce prices to the man on the farm and yet increase wages?

MR. HUNTER. Well, there will be an adjustment when prices come down.

MR. BENHAM. Do you know whether what you have told us about the prosperity of the small farmer in the Middle West, his ability to wear silk shirts, etc., is true of the farmer in the East?

MR. HUNTER. I am not familiar with the farmers east of Chicago, but from Chicago to the Pacific coast she's blooming like a rose.

MR. BEKHAM. On cheap, virgin land?

MR. HUNTER. Well, it is not as cheap as it ought to be.

MR. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, the land out West is higher priced per acre than the land in the East?

MR. HUNTER. Oh, yes. Land in Illinois is selling in some cases for \$300 an acre, and \$250 an acre in Iowa. In Yankton, S. Dak., last spring a farm sold at \$255 per acre.

MR. ELSTON. Then, the land in the Middle West is higher than the land in the East?

MR. HUNTER. Oh, there is no doubt about it.

MR. ELSTON. That is what I thought.

MR. HUNTER. Because we have better farming conditions there, better soil, younger soil, and big, broad prairies. That accounts for it.

MR. MAYS. And properly tilled it will last a long time?

MR. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

MR. MAYS. The gentleman speaks of virgin land. Do you find that the land wears out at an early date in the West?

MR. HUNTER. No, sir. I have always farmed in the West, because I was brought up on a farm, and I have always spent my holidays on a farm. In the Jim River Valley in South Dakota I grew 21 crops of wheat on one piece of land, and the last crop was as good as the first. The crop on that farm averaged from 10 to 35 bushels an acre.

MR. SMITH. Did you use fertilizer?

MR. HUNTER. No, sir.

MR. BARBOUR. Did you alternate your crop?

MR. HUNTER. No, sir. I burned it off and grew wheat every year. That valley is 150 miles wide and never has overflowed.

MR. MAYS. How much land do you sell to an individual?

MR. HUNTER. Three hundred and twenty acres.

MR. MAYS. That is the maximum?

MR. HUNTER. Yes, sir. Well, if he a good man, and a hum-dinger, I will sell him a section. I took one returned soldier up there and showed him the country and he took 960 acres, \$1,800 worth of ma-

chinery, four good horses, a thoroughbred bull, some thoroughbred cows, and some chickens. He is 6 miles out from town, and that land is certainly going to improve.

Mr. RAKER. Speaking of these hum-dingers, if he wants to get some return on this wheat he has to pay two or three times as much for his machinery and about three times as much for his horses and harness.

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, yes; because I have lived in the country where they sell them for 35 years, and his team will cost him \$250. He pays for the things he buys to make his home two or three times. Now, he must get some return for what he raises.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, he does. He can buy a good farm team for \$200.

Mr. RAKER. Twelve hundred-pound horses?

Mr. HUNTER. The tractor has taken the place of the horses. The tractor is going to do for farming just what the automobile has done for transportation on the highway, and that is what we are using. Take this man I have just been speaking about. He has a tractor that does the work of 20 horses and he can handle it himself. He saves three men on that place, and that tractor only eats when it works, and then it does not cost more for oil than feed for a team. Now, that man can keep 20 cows instead of 20 horses, and at the present price of butterfat each cow will earn \$50 a piece and bring him a calf worth \$35. That is the way we farm in that country. You understand that when the man is on the farm he has no house rent to pay, he has his meat, vegetables, butter, milk and eggs, and his poultry. He does not have to go around in Sunday clothes; he just wears overalls, so what use has he got for money?

Mr. VAILE. He might need a silk shirt to go to a dance.

Mr. HUNTER. He would not use them if he had them. He has no appearances to keep up. He can not wear a stiff collar to drive a plow or break a bronco. He has got to be dressed for that purpose. Now, all through that country we have the lignite coal, and he goes out and digs his coal, and all he has to buy is a little sugar for his coffee and a few clothes. I think these prices will come down eventually, but farm prices will never be where they were 10 years ago, because if they do the farmers will not raise the stuff; they will curtail the production. The farmers are getting well organized throughout the North, and they are pretty intelligent farmers. So far as cash money goes the farmer in Dakota on the poorest 640 acre tract, if he has a span of mares, some cows, pigs, and chickens, is just as far ahead of the man in Chicago working for \$300 a month as God is from a tree toad.

Mr. VAILE. Some people have tried to tell us that the organization of the Nonpartisan League in that part of the country was due to dissatisfaction on the part of the farmer.

Mr. HUNTER. I do not think so. That was due to a lot of hot air well applied, and if they had an election this month they would knock most of that political "flu."

Mr. RAKER. In Nevada, where I have visited, they have to struggle very hard to supply their homes with the necessities of life, and it takes all they can raise or make to keep the wolf from the door.

Those farmers are deprived of some of the necessities of life and are losing some of the pleasures of life.

Mr. HUNTER. But they are unfortunate in being located in the wrong part of the country.

Mr. BENHAM. Is there room enough for all of us in your part of the country?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, if the Government will open it up there might be.

Mr. MAYS. How much do you advance the settler for buildings?

Mr. HUNTER. It costs about \$3,500 cash investment for me to start a man on a half section of land.

Mr. MAYS. In buildings and equipment?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Just what does that include?

Mr. HUNTER. It will cost about \$2,500 for the buildings. In the first place you build a house for the housewife and she will never kick.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you describe those buildings?

Mr. HUNTER. For the Russians I built a house 18 by 24, with three rooms, which is all they need for a small family.

The CHAIRMAN. What did that cost?

Mr. HUNTER. About \$800. I put a good cellar and foundation under it.

Mr. RAKER. What did you sell them for?

Mr. HUNTER. I sold them at just what they cost. The money I make is what I get on the acreage of the farm. I do not get much from that, but still it is a good price.

Mr. RAKER. You sell it at cost price?

Mr. HUNTER. I sell the farmer a farm—they are all alike—and I say: "Now, Bill, I want so much money on this—so much on buildings and improvements," and they usually pay me from \$500 to \$1,000 on the farm. They pay that right down. Then, I make an additional agreement that he is to farm a certain part of the farm under my direction and bring so much a year; and I put in the contract that I am to place so much buildings on the property; I ship the lumber there, he puts up the buildings and gets them for cost.

Mr. RAKER. Now, how many farmers could you locate in this way in the country that you know, if you had the money means to do it?

Mr. HUNTER. It is unlimited.

Mr. RAKER. Just give a rough guess—500,000?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, no; not 500,000. I would not say that. That would be taking an awfully big leap.

Mr. RAKER. Well, how many farmers could you locate under the conditions you have described to the committee?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, with capital enough behind it, I could put 10,000 farmers in South Dakota.

Mr. RAKER. Anywhere else than South Dakota?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, 40,000 in Montana.

Mr. RAKER. That is 60,000. How many more?

Mr. HUNTER. If you carry out the irrigation projects you have in Washington, you could put 100,000 people there.

Mr. RAKER. That makes 160,000 people.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, how long would it take to put them on that land in those States?

Mr. HUNTER. That would be an engineering proposition. I do not know how long it would take to put the water in Montana. In Dakota we have the water and you could put them on as fast as they came.

Mr. RAKER. If you had the water, then, you could provide immediately for 160,000 people?

Mr. HUNTER. I think so. I know I could take care of 10,000 farmers in the year in South Dakota if I had the capital and if the Government would open up Indian reservations and put cheaper land on the market.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any difficulty in finding men willing to take advantage of these opportunities?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir; when you get one colony started, they will keep coming.

Mr. SMITH. And you do not have to do any advertising?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Why can not this scheme be carried on more extensively?

Mr. HUNTER. Because men of money have got into the habit of putting their money into stocks and bonds and things of that kind that they can turn into cash at any time; they are speculators. If a man buys a piece of land he can not put it on the board of trade and get his money back on it when he wants it. The rural credit system of North and South Dakota is a great help to the farmer, as well as the Federal loan banks. They have helped a wonderful lot of people get cheap money.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your belief now that there should be a provision in the proposed legislation that the Secretary of the Interior should have the power to go out and select tracts of land wherever he could find it and put soldiers on it?

Mr. HUNTER. I think he should have that power. I think there should be a commission in each State, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to go out and investigate inquiries that come to it, and take the people out and put them on the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would give us the other items of improvements. You have given us about \$800 for the house. What about the other items?

Mr. HUNTER. The barn and chicken house will cost about \$800 more. The well will cost him, properly fixed up, with windmill and tank, \$200. Where he does the work himself the fence will cost him about \$100 a mile—a three-wire fence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything more?

Mr. HUNTER. That is all in the way of improvements. Then there is the cattle to be furnished. I never furnish a man less than four cows if he has 160 acres, and if he has 320 acres I give him 10 cows, charge him 7 per cent interest, and he gives a mortgage on the increase. Altogether, it will run from \$3,000 to \$3,500 for buildings, improvements, and cattle.

Mr. ELSTON. That would not apply to a 40-acre tract in an irrigation district where they were growing alfalfa?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, 40 acres of land is too small to handle unless you are raising vegetables; you would be making hand farmers and peasants. That was the trouble on the Huntley project in Montana; they had to increase the acreage before they could make a percentage.

Mr. ELSTON. But you are speaking of rough land and not irrigated land in Idaho and California?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, yes; of course, for what they raise in those States 40 acres would be plenty.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it is well known that in the far West 40 acres will support a family very well.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir. But what the Government ought to do is to get the soldiers out where they raise corn and grain and alfalfa, because if you put too many on small farms you will not get enough for your produce.

Mr. ELSTON. I was not speaking of produce; I was speaking of alfalfa where they have several crops a year.

Mr. HUNTER. Alfalfa is all right for 40 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with certain resolutions passed by the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, last November, against this plan?

Mr. HUNTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to read them to you and get your opinion on them. This is headed: "Farms for Soldiers" and reads:

We oppose the proposed plan of reclaiming swamp and arid lands for returning soldiers, as unsound, impractical, and detrimental to the interest of the Nation and agriculture.

That part is directed against the reclamation of swamp land and the irrigation of arid land.

The next sentence reads:

There is an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all soldiers who may wish farm land. The Government should meet this need in this way, so that they may become self-supporting and useful without waste and delay.

I would like to get your views upon that resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. That was passed by the National Grange?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. I think the idea they had in their head was that they did not want to increase production and lower prices. That is the only reason for passing such a resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that theory is well founded, then—that it will increase production and decrease prices?

Mr. HUNTER. No, I do not think it will increase production beyond consumption, because I believe increased consumption will absorb increased production. In 10 years I do not think this country will be exporting a bushel of wheat or a pound of beef.

The CHAIRMAN. This resolution which I have read says: "There is an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all soldiers who may wish farm lands." As a matter of fact, there is an abundance of untenanted farms. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, there may be, but I do not think so. I think that is more theory than fact. You talk about the abandoned farms in the State of New York. I do not think there are as many there as the general public believes. Most of it is land that is too rocky

for cultivation and should never have been attempted as farm land.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the grange passed this resolution:

Land tenantry is increasing; farm ownership is concentrating in the hands of wealthy land holders, and abandoned farms are becoming too common. Legislation should be devised to encourage farm-home owning and to discourage land speculation and tenantry.

Mr. HUNTER. That is just what I am advocating: Put these people on the land and let them own their homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The resolution preceding that says this:

Better farm credit. Every possible means should be provided to assist men of character and training to secure farm homes and establish a system of personal credit for the purpose of increasing farm ownership. To this end we favor such amendment of the land-bank law as will extend its benefits more widely.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, the land bank law refers to the Federal loan bank, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. I assume so.

Mr. HUNTER. That is working out fine in the Northwest. A man can get a loan on his property maturing in 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, our object, really, is to carry out the purposes of these two last resolutions I have read—to increase farm-home ownership.

Mr. HUNTER. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish you would go into more detail about what you do for the settler. You say you build him a house, and barn, and chicken house, and then he has trees and a garden?

Mr. HUNTER. After we get the land broken and under cultivation they have nice gardens. The Russians have very nice gardens.

Mr. TILLMAN. You believe in encouraging that?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Your theory is that he is going to remain there, as a fixture on the land?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; when he goes there he expects to stay there, and he does. I know some people who own the same farm they owned 30 years ago and they spend their winters in California; their farm is paying about 20 per cent dividend. I have seen an American come into Dakota with his family, take a preemption and homestead, build up a good farm, and when his boys grew up they went into town to work in the bank or in a store, and a foreigner would come along and buy the old man out. Now, these boys are living from hand to mouth, hanging on by their eyebrows, while the old man who held on to the farm is rich. I have a lot of American boys on my farms and they are all making good, bringing up their families and showing themselves to be good citizens. There is no better farmer in the world than the American farmer.

Mr. TILLMAN. Have you had any experience with the fellows who come from town with no knowledge of farming, who have never been on a farm?

Mr. HUNTER. No; I never had. But with the county agent to instruct him in the farm business, there is no reason why he should not make good if he wants to stick there. I think, though, you will find there are very few people who want to leave the cities now. The majority of the men you get on these new farms are the farmer boy.

For instance, there is a man in Illinois who has a farm worth \$300 an acre. He has five boys and he can not buy all of them farms; he can not break up his farm for them and at the present prices those boys can not buy farms, and if they want to stay on a farm they have got to go West and take up one of these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say a while ago that you could make a success with the inexperienced man, the man who had no experience in farming?

Mr. HUNTER. I think you can, because it is only a question of being willing to work. It is a simple matter in my country. It might not be so in the irrigated districts in the West, because he might have to have more instruction. But in my section of the West any man who is willing and can work intelligently can make a success of it.

Mr. RAKER. I want to ask you about this man that you sell this land to. About how much do you get in advance when he takes it?

Mr. HUNTER. Where I buy Indian land I pay \$15 an acre and I make a quarter payment down, 25 per cent. and the balance continues over four years. If I get a fellow who will come down and occupy that land I sell it at an advance of from \$2.50 to \$5 an acre.

Mr. RAKER. You think that is fair, considering that you are handling the land?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. RAKER. Will you give your experience to the committee on this subject? In most all these lands only about one-third or one-fourth of it is under cultivation when you sell it?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, practically none of it is under cultivation when I sell it, but it grows up.

Mr. RAKER. I want you to state whether it is better to have the farm all cultivated, with fences, buildings, and roads, before you put the man on, or do you think it is advisable to put up a house and barn and other buildings, and furnish the machinery, and then let the man work out his own destiny, taking 10 acres this year and 10 acres next year, bringing his family there and developing it himself, as against developing it all at once and putting him on a highly developed farm? What is your theory?

Mr. HUNTER. My theory is just what my practice is. I make that fellow go to work the minute I sell the farm to him. Of course, I would not break a farm and put it all under cultivation before I turned it over to him.

Mr. RAKER. That is what I want to know. Before a man goes on a farm with his wife and family, do you believe it is better husbandry to build the farm and have it ready for occupation, so that there will be no grubbing of stumps or plowing, or would you have it developed gradually?

Mr. HUNTER. I would make him develop it himself. I would give him a start and let him work out his own salvation.

Mr. RAKER. You think that is the better plan?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely.

Mr. RAKER. Now, as to the location of the land; would you make a center of the community, say 10 miles square, and have a center where he would live and work his farm from that center, or would you put him on the farm like we work farms in this country?

Mr. HUNTER. I would put him on a separate farm and keep him as far away from the town as you can get him.

Mr. RAKER. I want to know why—

Mr. ELSTON (interposing). Mr. Raker, that has been gone into very thoroughly this morning.

Mr. RAKER. Not by this man.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Well, let his answer my question.

Mr. ELSTON. I think he has answered it.

Mr. RAKER. No, he has not.

Mr. VAILE. That was gone into when you were not in the room, Judge. Mr. Hunter developed that before you came in.

Mr. HUNTER. I think it would be better to put him out by himself and let him develop his own farm, because otherwise I do not believe you will have a success.

Mr. SMITH. How long on the average does it take these men to complete the payment of their obligations—three or four years?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, yes; more than that.

Mr. SMITH. About how long?

Mr. HUNTER. With ordinary crops an average man will pay out in from 6 to 10 years.

Now, gentlemen, I have no ax to grind in this matter in any way at all. I just want to tell you what has been done. I thank you very much for this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is obliged to you. We will now hear from Mr. Gibson who, I understand, represents the Michigan Land Settlement Commission. Mr. Gibson, will you state your name, occupation, and just what that commission is?

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN I. GIBSON, REPRESENTING THE MICHIGAN LAND SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.

Mr. GIBSON. My name is John I. Gibson. I am a member of the commission appointed by the governor of Michigan to study the question of soldier land settlement as proposed by Secretary of Interior Lane, and to outline a general land settlement policy applicable to returning soldiers, sailors, marines, and others. Besides, I am secretary of the Western Michigan Development Bureau, a Michigan corporation not for pecuniary profit which has been in the colonization business for about 10 years in the cut-over land region of northwestern Michigan. I will not take the time of the committee to make any lengthy statement because I think the ground has been covered quite thoroughly already. I wish, though, in the first place, to take issue with the last speaker with reference to what he said about community settlements. As far as the cut-over lands of the northern part of Michigan are concerned, I do not think his views would hold good. I favor community settlement as against the segregated unit plan. There are in the United States 200,000,000 acres of cut-over land that are suitable for agricultural development, and this great area of land is increasing at the rate of 15,000,000 acres a year. It will perhaps convey to you some idea of this vastness of the area when I tell you that in order to go over this 200,000,000-acre tract and cross each of the 312,500 sections once and walking 20 miles every day for 365 days every year would require 43 years. If one should go in a Ford and cover 100 sections a day instead of

20 it would take 8 years and 7 months to get back home, barring tire trouble. We have in northern Michigan 11,686,000 acres of cut-over land and 2,947,439 acres of swamp land. The utilization of this land is a matter which vitally concerns not only the State and the Nation but also the entire world.

The State land commission appointed by our governor made a report on March 12, 1919, which was printed. I am under the impression that copies of this report were mailed to the members of this Public Lands Committee. I will be glad to furnish a copy to any member who hasn't got one. Our State land commission and the western Michigan Development Bureau are heartily in favor of the Mondell bill. We have been trying to get settlers on our cut-over lands for about 10 years and it is our experience that segregated settlement is a slow and unsatisfactory method. To put a man out in the wilderness and leave him there to clear the stumps and make a farm home without the help and cooperation of neighbors is hardly fair and is one of the prime reasons why we have so many failures. The plan of the bill under discussion is more feasible and likely to succeed, besides it will be an object lesson showing the value of cooperation and teamwork in clearing the land and making partially prepared farms with the aid of suitable machinery. In Wisconsin they are sending out land-clearing trains to show the farmers how to clear the land in a large way, at a greatly reduced cost. With our present method of settling the cut-over land of Michigan we would not finish the job until the crack of doom.

The CHAIRMAN. What does it cost to clear the land?

Mr. GIBSON. Approximately, from \$15 to \$35 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the stumpage per acre?

Mr. GIBSON. It varies greatly, but taking good, bad, and indifferent, the pine would run from ten to twelve thousand, and the hardwood nine to ten thousand. The land can be bought for from \$5 an acre up.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you utilize the pine stumps you pull from the land?

Mr. GIBSON. Not now. Several unsuccessful attempts have been made to extract turpentine from the pine stumps, but it couldn't be made to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON. They are doing it very successfully in my State.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I know you are, but for some reason or other we have not been able to produce the turpentine as cheaply as you can in the South.

Mr. JOHNSON. They are making rosin and turpentine.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; and I know that some by-products made from the pine stumps earned large profits during the war.

Mr. TAYLOR. What percentage of the cut-over land in your state will make good farm land?

Mr. GIBSON. I should figure approximately 20 per cent is light soil jack pineland and about 75 per cent will grow successfully the crops that are suited to the climate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you have to make that good by fertilizer or would you consider it workable land?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; commercial fertilizer is a valuable help, but there are thousands of acres of virgin soil in northern Michigan

that will produce crops at a profit without the application of fertilizer or manure. It is not generally known that some of our pine-lands which were considered worthless is where we now have some of our best orchards. The light-soil land in most cases needs either marl or lime applied to sweeten the soil. After the acidity has been removed from the soil the best method is to plant some of the legumes, such as sweet clover, hairy vetch, alfalfa, or cowpeas, which, as you know, have colonies of bacteria on their roots which feed on nitrogen and have the power to take the free nitrogen that is so abundant in the air and fix it in the soil. Nitrogen is what this kind of soil needs, and in order to get humus into the soil enabling it to better retain moisture these leguminous crops are plowed under green. I think the time is coming soon, as stated by the witness who preceded me, when we will have all we can do to feed our own people. The last census showed that the population increased at the rate of one million a year, so that by the year 1930 we will have a population of about 125,000,000 and unless we increase the area of cultivated land faster than we are doing now we will require a Hoover to ration us and white bread will disappear from the table of the ordinary man. The population of this country is increasing nearly twice as fast as the cultivated land area, according to recent statistics.

Mr. TAYLOR. How is your Michigan delegation in Congress? Are they in favor of this measure?

Mr. GIBSON. I believe most of them are, but some of them have not expressed themselves to me. I wish to call attention to some of the objections that have been raised to putting soldiers and sailors on the land, particularly the one of overproduction, which the chairman called attention to in reading the resolutions of the National Grange. By the way, I might say here that the Michigan Business Farmer, which is the official organ of the "Gleaners" had an editorial in the last issue in favor of the national soldier settlement act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the State grange paper?

Mr. GIBSON. No; it is the organ of the State Gleaners. The grange paper, the Michigan Farmer, is also in favor of the bill. The overproduction objection is something of a bugaboo, because, as I have said, the population is rapidly increasing and production is not keeping pace. The statement was made not long since by Wallace's Farmer that if the amount of nitrogen potassium and phosphorus actually used in growing eight of the leading crops of Iowa last year were figured at the regular prices at which they were sold during 1918, it would be found that these eight principal crops had removed from the soil of that State these elements to the value of \$216,000,000 or, to put it another way, it cost Iowa the equivalent of \$216,000,000 worth of fertilizer to produce eight of its leading crops last year. When, in addition to this, the increase in tenant farming and the exodus from the country to the city is taken into consideration, it seems to me the danger of overproduction of farm crops is a remote contingency.

Mr. NICHOLS. Referring to Mr. Taylor's question about Michigan, I will inform Mr. Taylor that most of the Michigan delegation in Congress are in favor of some such proposition as this.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to hear it, because they are a very strong delegation. I hope they are all in favor of it.

Mr. RAKER. You did not complete your answer about the land being sold for \$150 an acre. You say you grew fruit on it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, sir; I grew peaches, cherries, apples, and some small fruits. It would be hard to make a living on 20 acres of light soil land even after it had been brought to a proper condition of tilth, unless one practiced intensive farming and grew garden truck or fruit. You may not be aware that our western Michigan "Sunny-ripe" apples are the best in the world.

Mr. ELSTON. You were about to express an opinion with regard to the community plan of farming as against the isolated plan. What is your idea?

Mr. GIBSON. My experience during the past 10 years with the individual method has convinced me that the community plan is the best for cut-over land, and I am in favor of it, and so is our State land commission and the Western Michigan Development Bureau, both of which I represent.

Mr. VAILE. In favor of what?

Mr. GIBSON. Of the community plan, as applied to cut-over land.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the community plan?

Mr. GIBSON. I mean the plan outlined in the Mondell bill. I would like to suggest, though, that in some cases the unit be reduced to 50 families with 80 acres each, instead of 100 families. It is rather a difficult matter to get 10,000 acres of good land in a single unit.

Mr. VAILE. When you say you are in favor of the community plan, do you mean that you are in favor of a common enterprise in clearing stumpage, or, in the case of the West, irrigation, or would you go further than that and advocate living together in some community center?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. I favor a common enterprise, but not the collecting the soldier farmers in villages as is done on the continent of Europe.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then tell us how and why and in what way.

Mr. GIBSON. The idea has been expressed that farm life nowadays is not isolated, but notwithstanding the telephone, rural free delivery, good roads, and the Ford car there is still a good deal of lonesomeness on the farm, especially in sparsely settled localities. I believe the neighbors and the community life would be a great help in holding people on the farms, especially the returned soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not understand the community settlement as holding the people in a town, but simply having a public hall where they can meet and hold—

Mr. GIBSON (interposing). Moving pictures, say, and a place where they could hold meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. But I do not understand you to say that the Government should supply moving pictures to these farmers.

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, no; just a place where they could hold community meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Simply a common meeting place?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is all right to have a community hall, but I would not think of moving pictures. How long have you lived in Michigan?

Mr. GIBSON. Off and on since 1889.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you observed whether or not these individual farmers live on separate farms or in settlements out there—do they live in town and go out to their lot and farm it?

Mr. GIBSON. None that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. There are none of that kind of community settlements?

Mr. GIBSON. None that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, are you familiar with the French, the Italian, and the Belgium community settlements?

Mr. GIBSON. No; but I am familiar with the New Zealand settlement plan, because I lived there.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us talk about the ones we know about. I do not care to go into the New Zealand proposition at this particular time.

Mr. GIBSON. Although I have been on the European Continent, I am not familiar with the present farming practiced there.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not want the community settlement and development of the farming lands in this country on a line like that in France or Italy, do you?

Mr. GIBSON. No; not that kind of peasantry plan.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you want the farmers to live independently on their individual tracts, is that right?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; but have a community center to which they can come if they desire. That is what I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. And the cooperative work you are speaking of is development where they all get together and get a large outfit and equipment to clear land?

Mr. GIBSON. Build the roads and get things to going, so that they can get their products to market, and all that kind of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not mean to put them all in the town and let them live there and have their homes there and then farm their land from that town?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gibson, you said you desired to reply to some objections.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. I have answered one, with regard to the over production. Another objection raised was this. I said to one Member of Congress that I thought it was our job to feed the world, and he replied that he was through with that charity business; we had done enough of it. I did not mean that we are to feed the world and not get any pay for it. I believe in feeding the world and being paid for it, either in money or exchange of goods; this will make cargoes for our American ships and help to develop our export trade. Take my own case. I have exported apples to Great Britain but I was never able to ship one car of apples in an American bottom—it was always a British ship. Now, we have got the ships and it is up to us to provide the cargoes to support our new merchant marine.

Then there was another objection, viz, that few if any of the returning soldiers and sailors wanted to take up farming as a permanent occupation.

Mr. RAKER. I was talking to a Michigan farmer here a couple of months ago. He had raised many tons of potatoes. They were worth out there between 50 and 60 cents a bushel, while they were selling down here for \$8 or \$9—say \$5 a bushel—while the farmers were depressed because they could not get enough for their labor and products.

Mr. GIBSON. We are solving that largely by cooperative marketing associations. We have one such association in western Michigan that shipped this last season about 1,800 cars of potatoes and sold them at a price that brought the growers satisfactory returns. Of course, potatoes have brought good prices this year, but we are advocating, Mr. Chairman, the growing of less beans and potatoes and more live stock. Live stock is the foundation of all successful farming; and we have it on the authority of Mr. Marshall, the head of the Animal Husbandry Division of the Department of Agriculture, that we have the last cheap grassland in the world, in the Great Lake States, and grass, as you all know, is the chief factor in stock raising. Our object in this is to have something to put back into the soil and to secure the right kind of crop rotation.

Mr. RAKER. Do I understand you to say that your organization is discouraging the production of beans and potatoes and other products of that kind because of the overproduction in Michigan?

Mr. GIBSON. Our reasons, largely, are these: We want to increase the fertility of the land by the use of the manure from the cattle, and as I have said, get the proper crop rotation, and also because we believe that our farmers have been producing too many potatoes and beans.

Mr. TAYLOR. You mean a reduction of crops?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; a reduction of these two particular crops.

Mr. RAKER. Now, you may go ahead and I will not interrupt you any more.

Mr. GIBSON. In my opinion the objection that not many soldiers want to farm is not valid, because in my visits to Camp Custer I found quite a good many men who were interested in farming and who wanted to know what we had to offer in Michigan. Another objection which was raised was that there were a large number who made a failure of farming in northern Michigan. While it is true that we have some failures it is also true that quite a good many new settlers succeed. There are several reasons for the failures. The newcomers sometimes fall into the hands of unscrupulous real estate dealers who sell them poor land and charge them a high price for it, so that they can never get their heads above water. Then there is the oft-repeated mistake of putting a round man in a square hole. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman who preceded me when he said that where this whole proposition is most likely to fail is in not making the proper selection of the men to go on the land. I think that is the most important thing of the whole proposition—the selection of the men. How that selection should be made I am not prepared to say.

Another reason of failure is the lack of capital. This lack is provided for in the Mondell bill. I think, too, there ought to be a provision in this bill that would include in its provisions not only soldiers and sailors, but any other qualified citizens who wished to take

advantage of it, giving preference to the soldiers and sailors. I am strongly in favor of this, because I believe that every American citizen ought to be given an opportunity to take advantage of this opportunity to get on the land. The prosperity and happiness of the State and of the Nation depend to a large extent on the number of people who are producers of food and raw materials, living in contentment and well-being on the land. This being so, land settlement is primarily a matter of public concern.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does this cut-over land have to be drained?

Mr. GIBSON. No; a great deal of it has natural drainage. We have some swamp land, though—nearly 3,000,000 acres, about half of which might be profitably drained—it would cost too much to bring the balance of the swamp land into cultivation.

Mr. SMITH. What is the cost per acre, Mr. Gibson, of the reclamation of this cut-over land you have in Michigan?

Mr. GIBSON. Clearing would cost from \$15 to \$35 per acre.

Mr. SMITH. What would be the expense of preparing it for cultivation?

Mr. GIBSON. When the land has been cleared it is ready for the plow.

Mr. SMITH. What does it cost uncleared?

Mr. GIBSON. \$5 per acre up.

Mr. SMITH. What will the land be worth after clearing, when it is ready for cultivation?

Mr. GIBSON. From \$25 to \$50 per acre.

Mr. SMITH. About the actual cost of reclamation?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. What is good farm land worth there that is under cultivation?

Mr. GIBSON. From \$30 an acre up, depending on the character of the soil, the location, condition of buildings, nearness to market, condition of roads, etc.

Mr. SMITH. Now, you spoke about opening the lands up to the general public. Do you not think it would be better to have future legislation, should it be found there are not sufficient soldiers to take advantage of this law, rather than to make it general in its application now?

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps that would be better. I did not think of that when I spoke before.

Mr. SMITH. In two or three years from now?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; after we find how the present plan works. Another objection which was raised was that we would not have soldiers enough to go on the land after they had returned to their home places and were absorbed into the farms and industries that they left. I visited Camp Custer several times and showed the soldiers moving pictures of western farm scenes and talked to a large number of the men, and I found quite a number of them anxious to go on the land, so I think there are more soldiers than we have any idea of that really want to become farmers.

Mr. SNELL. You say you are connected with some commission in the State?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, the State land commissions.

Mr. SNELL. By whom was that appointed?

Mr. GIBSON. By the governor.

Mr. SNELL. What is his object?

Mr. GIBSON. The object as stated in the printed report sent to the members of this committee is: "To formulate a land settlement policy for soldiers, sailors, and marines, and others."

Mr. SNELL. For the purpose of inducing the settlement of the cut-over lands in your State?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, and especially to furnish homes and congenial employment for our returning soldiers.

Mr. SNELL. When was it appointed?

Mr. GIBSON. It was appointed December 19, 1918.

Mr. SNELL. Reverting to the subject of which you were speaking a short while ago, a great deal of the land there in Michigan is, by its very nature, and the nature of the soil, particularly adapted to the growing of potatoes and beans and that sort of crops, is it not?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SNELL. It is a sandy soil.

Mr. GIBSON. It is not all sandy soil by any means. That is a point upon which most people have an erroneous idea.

Mr. SNELL. I have been over a good part of that State.

Mr. GIBSON. About 20 per cent of the land of northern Michigan is what is termed jack pine plains.

Mr. SNELL. Well, you take land in the northern part of the southern peninsula—it is practically all of that general nature, is it not?

Mr. GIBSON. No, not all, but a good deal of it is of a sandy loam character. Traveling north from Grand Rapids on gives one a wrong impression of the country, because the railroads run along the pine ridges, and one only sees for the most part the poorest kind of sandy land. A little back from the railroad tracks, on either side there are good farms and large areas of cleared land.

Mr. SNELL. Yes, I have been all through that country. But you speak of land of that character when you refer to this bill?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, sir. I refer to the land as it actually is a variety of soils.

Mr. SNELL. Have you ever stopped to consider how much it would cost the Public Treasury to follow out this subject?

Mr. GIBSON. You mean what it would cost to get 80 acres into shape in Michigan?

Mr. SNELL. The question is how much money would it take to do all this? This bill proposes \$500,000,000, but how much would the aggregate be?

Mr. GIBSON. Before this bill was introduced I thought \$100,000,000 asked for by the previous bill was a great deal of money, and that it might be sufficient to carry out the project.

Mr. SNELL. Why did you figure so?

Mr. GIBSON. Because I figured in our country 80 acres can be prepared and got ready, with 20 acres brushed, and 20 acres cleared, fences put up, barn and house erected, and well driven for from four to five thousand dollars.

Mr. SNELL. Well, there are 4,500,000 who can take advantage of this.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think there would be so many as that.

Mr. SNELL. Well, all the soldiers, sailors, and marines discharged could take advantage of it if they cared to. You certainly must have

investigated the entire question and figured about what proportion would take advantage of it.

Mr. GIBSON. At Camp Custer and some of the other camps I found that approximately 15 per cent of the men who wished to take advantage of Secretary Lane's plan——

Mr. SNELL. Of the men in the camps that would take advantage of it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Where do they come from mostly?

Mr. GIBSON. The men I talked to were largely from overseas.

Mr. SNELL. I mean, from cities, or what part of the United States?

Mr. GIBSON. They were from all parts of the United States, and some from Canada; by far the larger number had either been brought up on a farm or were farmers' sons, or had some experience in farming. The majority of those who expressed a desire to locate in Michigan were Michiganders.

Mr. SNELL. The reason I am asking these questions is that we want to get some definite idea as to how much it will eventually take out of the Treasury after it gets started. Have you made any investigation about that proposition you had?

Mr. GIBSON. It would not be so staggering if the percentage did not run above 15 per cent, and besides it is to be a revolving fund and will eventually be paid back.

Mr. SNELL. Well, you do not know. I thought perhaps you had made some special study of that. You say you are in favor of this bill, and the knowledge of fairly definite figures as to its operation is one of the elemental things to be considered in this bill, or in like legislation—the estimation of what it is going to cost and how we are going to pay for it; and, while the scheme may be good, you must consider those things.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, we have considered and discussed this phase of the question a number of times, but it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion as to what the actual cost will be, but so long as it is in the form of a revolving fund the total cost does not make any material difference.

Mr. SNELL. In other words, you do not know how many men are going to take advantage of it?

Mr. GIBSON. Not definitely, no. I guess about 15 per cent.

Mr. SNELL. No; and there is no way we can find out either.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did not the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, say it would be about 16 per cent who would take advantage of it?

Mr. GIBSON. When I made my estimate of 15 per cent I did not know that Secretary Lane had said 16 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Every man that takes advantage of it puts the Government that much ahead.

Mr. GIBSON. And the world, too.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the cost factor, no matter how large it is, how indefinite it is, every dollar spent in this proposition will eventually be returned.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; with compound interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if it costs \$5,000,000,000 it would probably be worth twenty times that to this country, would it not?

Mr. GIBSON. That is my opinion of the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. The money comes back after 40 years at a low rate of interest and is in what might be termed a revolving fund, and is a great American developing proposition, is it not?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; and at the same time furnishing work and homes for the soldiers. I had a little experience in New Zealand when this was an untried scheme. It worked out there fairly successfully. They made some mistakes, of course, which we are taking advantage of. The Government cut up the large sheep ranches into small holdings and assisted all who were qualified to take up these small farms.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has been of inestimable value to them, has it not?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; it helped to make New Zealand prosperous and its people happy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you know how much they appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. GIBSON. I think the first appropriation was £2,000,000—that is, \$10,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. How long ago was that?

Mr. GIBSON. 1889.

Mr. WHITE. When were you there?

Mr. GIBSON. 1888, 1889, and 1890.

Mr. WHITE. What was the character of that land that they divided into 20, 40, 60, and 80 acre tracts; is that irrigated or unirrigated?

Mr. GIBSON. The north island of New Zealand has an annual average rainfall of about 40 inches. We have an annual rainfall of 32 inches in Michigan. New Zealand is just like Ireland—the grass is always green.

Mr. RAKER. Does your legislation make any provision for the sale of the land by the farmer?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Should a man's land be tied up for more than five years, or should he be given an opportunity to sell it to whom he saw fit after he had lived on it for 20 years under one of these projects? What is your view of that?

Mr. GIBSON. I would have it tied up.

Mr. RAKER. About how long?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, for at least 10 years.

Mr. RAKER. So that he could not sell it or mortgage it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. You think that would work out better?

Mr. GIBSON. I think it would.

Mr. RAKER. What is the system that you folks work in Michigan, and also that worked in New Zealand—you have had experience there?

Mr. GIBSON. I don't know what the practice is in New Zealand now. We do not actually sell any land. The development bureau is a sort of a chamber of commerce for 20 counties in western Michigan. We exploit its agricultural resources and try to get new settlers.

Mr. RAKER. Has New Zealand a limitation as to time of sale?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; they have.

Mr. RAKER. Do you know what it is?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. RAKER. One further matter on that subject: For instance, in a project started by the Government we could expect to put it on

the basis of 80 acres to a farm. Would you let a man have more than one tract after he had purchased his homestead?

Mr. GIBSON. You mean additional acreage?

Mr. RAKER. Suppose he took a tract of either 160, or 260, or 240, or 280, should a man be held down to that one tract, or should he be allowed to purchase more as he progresses?

Mr. GIBSON. He should certainly be able to buy all the land he can handle successfully. As I understand it, if a man does not follow the farming methods laid down by the Government experts the land will revert back to the Government.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose he is successful and gets a patent and is prosperous. It is your view that he should be permitted to go and buy as many other tracts in this project as he desires, or should he be held down to that one only?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I would not hold him down. Let him buy as many as he can farm successfully.

Mr. RAKER. You are not afraid of a monopoly?

Mr. GIBSON. No; not at all.

Mr. RAKER. Would you have all the land cleared and cultivated, or would you have the one-quarter or one-third thus cleared and cultivated and then let the balance be cleared by such community efforts?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. My understanding of the matter is that in the cut-over land areas the tracts will be divided into farms of 80 acres each, with 20 acres brushed and 20 acres cleared. I think this is the best plan.

Mr. RAKER. And not have it all cleared?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I would not do that.

Mr. RAKER. And not leave any clearing for him to do?

Mr. GIBSON. No. Allow the soldier to use his own labor and that of his family, if he has one.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you mean by brushing 20?

Mr. GIBSON. Just taking out the underbrush, so that a man could plant his beans or potatoes between the stumps. Even at the present time some are farming in that fashion and have been doing so for years.

Mr. WHITE. Are those stumps valuable for fuel?

Mr. GIBSON. Not very valuable. We have tried to cut them up with a buzz saw, but it is a difficult and expensive job. They make good fences, though. They will stay put for a thousand years.

The CHAIRMAN. The next gentleman to address us is appearing on behalf of the Spanish War veterans.

STATEMENT OF D. V. CHISHOLM, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I am not a farmer, so I will not detain you long. I come, Mr. Chairman, to ask for a change in the bill. The language of it specifies that those who will benefit will only be soldiers, sailors, etc., of the present war. The changes I would call attention to and request appear on the first page and will make the bill apply to any soldier who has served in any war. They are entitled to share in the benefit and should not be discredited, and for that reason I am

asking that the bill be changed, together with Mr. McElroy, who is here representing the Grand Army. We request that the bill be changed on line 4.

Mr. SNELL. What page?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Page 1, by striking out "with the military or naval forces" and inserting in lieu thereof "Army, Navy, or Marine Corps"; by striking out, in line 5, after the word "States," "during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies," and inserting in lieu thereof "in time of war."

Mr. JOHNSON. I have a bill, Mr. Chisholm, bearing on the same subject. I introduced a bill to that effect.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Line 9, the two words "separated or," and in line 8, change the word "with" to "in."

The CHAIRMAN. What is your object in striking out the words "separated or"?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Because every man separated from the Army whether it be by reason of resignation or discharge—when a man resigns he gets a certificate of discharge, and "separated" is superfluous and not used in any soldiers' bill. In line 9, strike out the words "separated or" so that this change is made and will make the bill read:

That to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in time of war and have been honorably discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army Reserve, and former American citizens who served in and were honorably discharged from the military or naval forces of any of the nations, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be your purpose to exclude those in the Reserve at the present time?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Oh, no; our idea is that all those who served in or with the Army ought to secure these benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. Your idea is to give these benefits also to those who served in other wars?

Mr. CHISHOLM. In what period?

The CHAIRMAN. The Spanish-American War, Cuban war, and the Civil War.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members are there of the Spanish War veterans; how many are there surviving?

Mr. CHISHOLM. How many Spanish-American War veterans surviving?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM. About 390,000.

The CHAIRMAN. About 390,000. What is their average age?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I would say 45—between 42 and 45.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you think would like to receive the benefits of this act?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Well, I believe that the soldiers of the Spanish-American War probably would take a greater advantage of this proposition than the men of the later war, for the reason that those men of the Spanish War have got homes and are looking out for some possible investment and this, it appears to me, would be a good investment for a member of the Spanish War.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you give us an idea of the percentage which would take advantage of this proposition?

Mr. CHISHOLM. This came to me so much all of a sudden I have not had time to look into it or study it, but I would say that it would be 20 per cent which would probably take advantage of it—it would be in the neighborhood of 20 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be nearly 70,000?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I would say yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, has your organization taken official or formal action in this matter?

Mr. CHISHOLM. It has not.

The CHAIRMAN. Or are you just initiating this yourself?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I am ordered to do this by the commander in chief. The former commander in chief of our organization was a Member of your House, who died only a few days ago—Col. Van Dyke, and Mr. Jones, of New York, succeeded him.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his official position?

Mr. CHISHOLM. He is in the city government of the State of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill is for an authorization of \$500,000,000, probably to be expended in five years, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Interior. That will take care of approximately 80,000 soldiers. Now, assuming that to be true—that this authorization will only take care of 80,000 soldiers, and that that is all we are going to get, how would you apportion these homes among the soldiers of the present war—the soldiers of the Spanish-American War and other wars?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I have no idea as to that, except to give it to the first applicants.

The CHAIRMAN. The first ones who applied?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. You would leave it to the Secretary then to select the men?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not according to the war in which he served, but according to the adaptability of the man to the work?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Do you mean by that the magnitude of the war in which he served?

The CHAIRMAN. No; according to the war—I have nothing to say about the magnitude of the war.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Of course, when you begin to speak about wars—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we can not take care of all of them out of this appropriation; and it ought to be allotted in some way—either the way in which you mentioned or some other way.

Mr. McELROY. Gentlemen, I appear here for the National Tribune, which is the mouthpiece of the Civil War, and possibly I can throw a little light upon what you are struggling with—that is, a progressive piece of legislation. I have been editor of the Tribune for five years. All that time I have had inquiries and requests regarding this very question of homestead settlement. It is a progressive matter. Immediately after the war apparently few went to the farms. The war ended in 1865 and my remembrance is that in 1872 there was a great rush of comrades to the West—over 150,000—largely from the encampments. Very many went from the Sixty-sixth in New York, and I happen to know myself that they are now out in Minnesota.

It created quite a stir at the time, but that movement to the West was the thing which lifted us up out of the hole of debt which we were in at the close of the war. We had \$3,000,000,000—\$20,000,000 which we had to bear in taxation to enable us to pay off that great debt. Now, we paid \$150,000,000 a year in gold, which is equivalent to nearly \$300,000,000 of greenbacks. Now, it lifted us out of that hole—that remarkable wave. All the old soldiers who went to Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota in practically a few years prospered and added to the wealth and extent of the country. They were all Grand Army men and went out through South Dakota, North Dakota, not so much Oregon and Washington, but Minnesota, the Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho were all built up by the soldiers of the Civil War.

The CHAIRMAN. From the homestead act?

Mr. McELROY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we had a representative of the National Grange here the other day, who told us that the homestead law broke up many farms in the East and that it took 40 years to recover from the effects of it.

Mr. McELROY. Probably—if you will pardon an interruption—I can throw a little light on it. I have been writing and studying economic subjects for a long time. What broke up the homes in the East was probably the building of the Erie Canal; but, to go back, there was a great flood of these veterans who went out there, and you can hardly remember the time, but I do, I remember when Fremont and others were making the explorations through this wilderness. Within a few years they had transformed this wilderness out there into great prosperous States—those Grand Army men did it. I have not got statistics with me, but I think it was 44 per cent of their men indicated an intention to go back to the farms.

Mr. SMITH. Reverting to your suggestion that the words "Army, Navy, and Marine Corps" be substituted for "military and naval forces." The Marine Corps is a part of the naval forces.

Mr. CHISHOLM. That is just the ordinary way of putting it.

Mr. McELROY. I believe in using the customary and well-formed phrase which can not be misunderstood or misinterpreted. There are only two ways for a man to get out of the service of the United States. He can die, or he can be honorably discharged. Now, there is no use in meddling with something susceptible of different constructions.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say, Colonel, I have written to the Secretary of War to ascertain the technical meaning of this language, but I have not heard from him as yet.

Mr. SNELL. May I ask a question? I observe you have stricken out the word "with" or propose to strike out the word "with" and insert the word "in," thus restricting it to persons who were in the actual military service. That would exclude field clerks and the nurses corps. Is that the intention?

Mr. CHISHOLM. That is the intention; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You would exclude everybody who did not actually serve in the recognized branches of the military establishment?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH. Are not field clerks enlisted men?

Mr. CHISHOLM. There is a possibility there of that.

Mr. SNELL. The reason I asked about that is that in the War Risk Insurance Bureau and other war bills that we passed the nurses corps and the field clerks were included, and given the benefit of those acts on the theory from our House, at least, that they were a necessary part of the military establishment. Now, what do you think about excluding them from this?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I think it is absolutely proper to apply to only those men who are classed as soldiers, just men who enlisted or were drafted into the service.

Mr. SNELL. Because if the wording is not changed and it is introduced in its present form it would include the entire personnel.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Our idea is to get away from the men who were not actual participants.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with you about that. I am talking about particularly the field clerks and nurses.

Mr. CHISHOLM. They are enlisted.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; but they do not have a military status.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNELL. But they can not be separated from the service of their own initiative?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Absolutely.

Mr. SNELL. If you will make an investigation, Captain, I think you will find that they are not considered as enlisted into the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Would your language embrace those who were on the Mexican border?

Mr. CHISHOLM. We were not at war.

Mr. SMITH. Would you include the men who served on the Mexican border?

Mr. CHISHOLM. It would include all who served on the Mexican border. Well, if they were in the Army when war was declared, they would be entitled to receive the benefits of the act.

Mr. SMITH. They should be entitled to the benefits of the law because they were there performing military service and were subject to military orders even though they were not actually at war.

Mr. CHISHOLM. But they did not have a war status in the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Captain, should your amendment seem to jeopardize the passage of this bill, would you still insist upon it?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I hardly think I would be justified in saying yes. Now, it would seem that I would be justified in making a fight as long as it is possible for me to fight to see that it does get in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not want to jeopardize the passage of the bill?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I would hate to burden you gentlemen with the great mass of correspondence you would have to answer.

Mr. SMITH. I am inclined to think if this bill is amended as you suggest, it should be sufficiently definite to include the men who served in the Philippine insurrection as well.

Mr. CHISHOLM. It should include those who were in the Army when we were actually at war.

Mr. SMITH. There was no declaration of war, I believe, but it was an actual state of war without the declaration.

Mr. VALE. Did I understand Col. McElroy was just indorsing Mr. Chisholm's suggestion in regard to the inclusion of Spanish War veterans or that he appeared in connection with the Grand Army men as well—that they should receive the benefit of this act?

Mr. McELROY. No.

Mr. VALE. Colonel, I do not think you quite understand me. I want your idea in regard to including the Grand Army men in this bill.

Mr. McELROY. I want to say it seems to me that it would be of the highest public policy to include those men, and also to hold forth every inducement to enter the military and naval services of the United States. Now, we in the Grand Army have proceeded under some iron-clad rules. A man must have been in the service of the United States after the 4th of March, 1861, and prior to the 9th of April, 1865, and been honorably discharged. That is all we ask of any man to admit him to our organization.

Mr. VALE. Colonel, what I am asking about is whether or not you wish the veterans of the Civil War to have the benefits of this act.

Mr. McELROY. Certainly.

Mr. VALE. Do you think there would be many of them left to take advantage of it?

Mr. McELROY. Oh, yes; because I have a flood of letters every time an Indian reservation is opened up asking for information.

Mr. VALE. Then you think there would be a considerable number of them take advantage of it?

Mr. McELROY. Well, a good many would come out there. I started a colony in Florida; a great many soldiers went down there and are still working down there and others are going down. They still want to have some land of their own.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chisholm, I observe that you say "in time of war." The same thought occurs to me that did to Mr. Smith here. That excludes the members of our Military Establishment who were in the operations at Vera Cruz, does it not?

Mr. CHISHOLM. I should think not.

Mr. WHITE. When they landed at Vera Cruz and occupied the port, where many of them were wounded, and that excludes those men, because we were not technically at war; is that true?

Mr. CHISHOLM. That would have to be construed by the Military Establishment.

Mr. WHITE. This says "in time of war." War is only war when it is so declared by Congress.

Mr. CHISHOLM. As for myself, I would say that they would not be excluded.

Mr. WHITE. That would also bar the men who went after Villa, and would not include the men who were in Santo Domingo, and participated in those operations where many of them were killed and wounded; you would not include them according to that wording?

Mr. CHISHOLM. No.

Mr. WHITE. Well, don't you think they ought to be, now, just frankly? They were performing services for their country.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I have absolutely no objections.

Mr. WHITE. Under the command of their superior officers.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I have no objections to your putting in all that you please, as long as you leave the members of our little war some of the benefits that you give any other soldier.

Mr. WHITE. I am in favor of that.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I am in favor of you giving them the same benefits, so long as you do not cut us out.

Mr. McELROY. The Supreme Court has recognized a condition of war. Now, there have been a whole lot of endings of the War of the Rebellion. We of the Grand Army say the surrender of Lee. The Navy says the 5th of July, 1865. The Supreme Court has ruled that the condition of war ceased by the President issuing a proclamation restoring the civil courts and lifting the blockade. That was a progressive thing and continued until the 18th of August, 1866.

Mr. WHITE. And that same proposition would take into account the nurses who served overseas?

Mr. CHISHOLM. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS. If you adopt the word "separated" on the bottom of page 1—now, you know it has been revealed to this Congress, or the Sixty-fifth Congress, that there were a number of soldiers, just before the armistice was signed, who were tried by court-martial for insubordination simply for refusing to give a package of cigarettes up to a minor officer. These men were placed in prison where they served sentences. However, when the fact was discovered the President relieved them of those sentences. Do you not think they should be given the same benefit as the others? The word "separate" covers that?

Mr. CHISHOLM. The President, or the War Department can clear their records.

Mr. JOHNSON. They have already cleared their records.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Then they would be honorably discharged.

Mr. RAKER. Just a couple of questions—whether or not the legislation that is finally put through on this subject provides that the widows of these soldiers should receive the benefit of this homestead provision.

Mr. McELROY. Certainly.

Mr. CHISHOLM. We would not be true soldiers, if we did not stick to the women. This legislation should give the women the opportunity to go in and get a title to one of these homesteads.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the widow is to inherit, or the widow of any deceased soldier can go in herself?

Mr. RAKER. Lawful widow. If he has not obtained the benefits of this act and has a lawful widow surviving him, she should have the privileges extended to her.

Mr. SUMMERS. How about the mothers of those killed?

Mr. RAKER. The homestead act took in the widows of the soldiers of the Civil War, but I do not believe it went to the extent of giving the mothers, but I can not see why the field clerks, the Y. M. C. A., the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, or the Knights of Columbus, who actually went and were at the front participating and assisting, should not be given recognition, too.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Well, in my opinion I think they should have taken the same chance as those people who enlisted or were drafted. I think they should have all gone in as soldiers.

Mr. SUMMERS. A great number were not of military age.

Mr. CHISHOLM. A great many of the available men of those organizations could not have gotten into the Army.

Mr. RAKER. You want to limit it to men who have enlisted?

Mr. CHISHOLM. We only insist that a man should be definitely enlisted and honorably discharged.

Mr. SUMMERS. Field clerks are part of the military force and can not get out until they are honorably discharged.

Mr. SNELL. They have a military status, but they are not part of the Army—that is they are not counted as enlisted men and do not have a pensionable status like the ordinary soldier—they are not part of the Military Establishment, although they obey military orders and are connected with it. We discussed that question when we were considering the war-risk insurance bill.

Mr. CHISHOLM. In our organization we do not admit anyone unless he actually had enlisted and was discharged. Those are the people we represent.

Mr. VALE. While Capt. Chisholm is here, and for the information of the chairman, I will say in my little camp of Spanish War Veterans I have received a number of inquiries about this bill, and they seem to be all in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. They want to take advantage of it?

Mr. VALE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. That is true of my camp.

Mr. McELROY. Why, ever since the close of the war we have had people trying to get in and have a more or less definite connection with the Army. Some of them should have been included. The military telegraphers were under orders, as were the men who were writing messages. At the last national encampment the matter was taken up and discussed and it was felt that they should have brought in the telegraphers and those who served in the regular Marine Corps, but you start out with that same requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. Colonel, could you give us an outline of the various acts giving soldiers of the Civil War special consideration in the matter of land selection? I know there were some.

Mr. McELROY. Well, for a long time a man could go on to the ground and get his patent, having the time of his service in the military establishment deducted from the time required to prove up his claim. To-day they only require a year's residence. That applies to any soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. If he has seen service.

Mr. McELROY. And then there was a law providing for a five-year residence, but a man could get his patent after a term of residence on there equivalent to this and deducting his military service from the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Special consideration has heretofore been given to the soldiers, is that true?

Mr. McELROY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they had at that time the choice land of the country?

Mr. McELROY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And he also had the privilege of selecting his land through an agent?

Mr. McELROY. Oh, yes; there were various little features of that kind of which we got the benefit.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask both these gentlemen a question, and I do not ask it with any inclination or any thought of opposing your suggestion, but when this matter first started out in the last session of Congress it was before the Irrigation Committee. At that time it was thought there would not probably be sufficient members of the present war to take up all of these lands, and that we probably would have to throw it open to everybody else.

Then the pendulum swung to the other way and they decided that inasmuch as Canada and all the English-speaking countries of the world, and every civilized nation that was in this war was trying to do something special for the soldiers participating in this war because this war has been the greatest and most terrible ever, we ought to show these boys some special consideration, and not put them on a plane with everybody else in the world. Then, as I say, the pendulum swung the other way and the bill was written in this form limiting it to those participating in this war, and Secretary Lane appeared before us the other day and he said he was in favor of confining it to those men. He said that nobody had anything against or felt like discounting the aims of the Spanish War veterans, certainly not the Civil War veterans, but if we were going to do anything special for these boys like the other countries are doing—giving them \$8,000 or \$9,000 apiece to establish themselves in life—the Spanish War veterans are 20 years older; the Civil War veterans are 50 years older and they have all had opportunities to take their pick of the good land of the United States, and they have all of them had a fair amount of opportunity of taking lands under these other Government reclamation projects—there are 32 of them in numbers, and they are very advantageously arranged for settlers. We would not be showing proper consideration to the young men of this war if we threw it open and made it as you suggested, giving everybody an unlimited field.

The question is whether we could honorably and decently and fairly throw the land open to everybody and still show our boys that we appreciate their services in this war. Now, let me give you that thought, not from me, but as a question that we have got to meet on the floor of the House and before Secretary Lane, the real author of this whole proposition; and the question is whether or not we want to kill our golden goose, and whether we want to bite off more than we can chew and fall down on it; and how much support we can expect to get from doing the best we can and not trying to reach out for too much and fall down. As Mr. Graham suggests, if we are going to throw it wide open to everybody in the United States, why it may take \$10,000,000,000 and the question is whether or not we ought not to do something for these boys who have come home from this war. If they do not take advantage of it at the end of a year or some definite time, then we can throw it open to the veterans of the Spanish-American War and to everybody else. Now, what is your answer to that, to arguments of that kind, not coming from me, but as arguments which we have got to meet?

Mr. McELROY. The captain's suggestion is that a man must have enlisted in the service of the United States and been honorably

discharged—that is all he wants—for a man to have held up his hand and sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and obey the law. That is where it should stop, and let the boys have the first pick and let us take the second pick.

MR. CHISHOLM. I will answer you by saying that I consider a law—

MR. TAYLOR. You are not answering me. How are you going to meet such arguments as that?

MR. CHISHOLM. I would like to say to Secretary Lane, or anybody else, that I consider our soldiers of the Spanish War just as loyal and patriotic—

MR. TAYLOR (interposing). Oh, certainly, certainly.

MR. CHISHOLM (continuing). And did just as much as any soldier of this present war, or any previous war. The men who fought at Manila Bay, and in Cuba afterwards, were wounded and killed the same as in any other war, and the men made the same sacrifice and were equally deserving. Take my own case as an example. I got on a cattle boat for transportation south, and the lower end of the cattle boat where the cattle had been herded and were fed was fitted up in a rough way for us to eat and sleep, and the ship had not been out of the cattle-carrying trade very long either, and when we got to Cuba we were sick; and I might say this, that the men that returned from the Spanish-American War, as I understand it, lost about 26 pounds per man, while those who return from the present war have gained on an average of 12 pounds per man.

When I returned from Cuba I weighed 135 pounds. I was near death for nine months and spent all my money and got nothing from the Government for it at all. They placed me in charge of this legislation, so far as I might aid in presenting our case to Congress. I think the veterans of all wars should be put on the same footing, and then that will be perfectly satisfactory to every soldier of any kind. There has been a good deal of legislation for the veterans of the Civil War, but not until the last two years, and then only after tremendous pressure last year, was our widows' pension bill put through. Now, in its present shape, this bill is still against the soldier of the Spanish War, and I think it should be made so that no soldier is discriminated against. In passing, I would like to call attention to the fact that every soldier in the Spanish War was a volunteer.

MR. SMITH. I am a little curious to know how you arrive at your estimates that 20 per cent of the Spanish-American War veterans would take advantage of this proposition.

MR. CHISHOLM. Most of our men are getting along toward 40 or 45 years of age and to the point where they desire more than ever to own land.

MR. SMITH. But are not all those men established in their homes and business and activities so permanently that they would not want to change?

MR. CHISHOLM. That is a possibility, but not a certainty.

MR. SMITH. I doubt if there are 5 per cent of these men who would take advantage of it.

MR. CHISHOLM. The Spanish-American War men are still floating around the country. Some of them are in business; some are not working.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say I think this fear about flooding is entirely mythical. I do not think one-half of 1 per cent of the Spanish War veterans would take advantage of it. I do not believe there are 2 per cent or 1 per cent of the Spanish War veterans that will take advantage of it, but I have not any objection to their having the opportunity. I do not think they are going to take it at all, but it is a sentimental matter—the giving to them of the opportunity—but my thought is this, that we are not keeping up with the other nations in doing something special for our boys. So far we have not done one thing except to give them \$60.

Mr. NICHOLS. As a Nation we are not doing as much for our soldiers as the others.

Mr. TAYLOR. Canada has given them from \$5,000 to \$10,000 apiece and puts them on a 320-acre farm, where we have not done anything up to the present time.

Mr. SNELL. I think you are mistaken when you say that Canada is giving them \$5,000 or \$10,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Canada is putting the soldiers on the land and financing their stock, where as yet this country has not done anything for the returning soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. This seems to be a convenient point at which to adjourn. We will adjourn until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12.30 o'clock p. m., the hearing was adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m. June 4, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 4, 1919.

The committee met at 10.15 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. What witnesses are before the committee this morning? Will you appear, Mr. Nelson? Please state your name and whom you represent and your residence.

**STATEMENT OF MR. WILBUR A. NELSON, SECRETARY OF THE
TENNESSEE SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT BOARD.**

Mr. NELSON. I would like to read some changes that the board has suggested in the amount of money to be loaned to soldiers under the Mondell bill; also the percentage that the soldiers should pay as an initial payment.

It is considered by the Tennessee Soldiers' Settlement Board that section 3, paragraph 2, should be changed so that the Government should furnish 90 per cent of the cost of the value of the improvements, which 90 per cent should not exceed \$1,500; that in section 8 the amount in per cent be changed so that the Government furnish not more than 80 per cent of the cost of necessary live stock and equipment, and that such 80 per cent shall not exceed \$1,000.

In discussing further the provisions of the present bill as sent us we feel that it will be necessary for the soldiers getting land valued

at \$2,000 in a soldier-settlement project to make the Government practically a cash payment of \$1,000, and we feel that this plan is not made for the soldier who has \$1,000 and will not be accepted by such a soldier, but will be accepted by the soldier who has very little money.

Under the present provisions of the bill, the soldier who bought a \$2,000 farm would have to pay \$100 cash. He would then have to pay \$400 on the value of the house and barn which could not be built for less than \$1,600 maximum. That is the maximum amount carried in the bill. He would then have to pay a cash payment on stock and equipment of \$533 if he obtained the maximum loan of \$800 from the Government, and he would have to do this in order to buy stock and equipment necessary for his farm. The sum of \$100 for the land, \$400 for improvements, and \$533 for stock would make \$1,033 cash payment to be paid by any soldier availing himself of the Mondell plan.

All the Government wants is protection from the soldier, and it will certainly have this protection if it requires 5 per cent cash on the land, 10 per cent cash on improvements, and 20 per cent cash on stock and equipment. On this basis the soldier would be paying the Government approximately 10 per cent cash for what he receives on an expenditure by the Government of \$4,900. That is, considering \$2,000 the value of the land, \$1,650 for improvements, \$1,250 for stock, the soldier's cash payment being \$500.

Those are the changes in the bill that the Tennessee board would like to suggest to this committee.

I thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee desire to ask any questions of the witness?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I know that Mr. Mondell touched on the matter, and emphasized the fact that these payments were progressive, that they were not to be made at one time, so that the maximum percentage that was to be taken from the soldier would not be payable as soon as the soldier took up a unit. He would probably be at work on the project for a year and a half or two years, and then his improvements would be progressive, and the accumulation of stock would be progressive, so that he would not have to have the full amount at first flush.

Mr. NELSON. As I understood it, in order for the soldier to avail himself of the \$800 loaned by the Government, he would have to put cash \$533.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the maximum amount that the Government would lend him. Then the amount at first may be \$200 or \$100, and his maximum credit at any one time would not exceed the \$800. But it was not expected, according to Mr. Mondell's explanation, that he would start out full fledged at the beginning, particularly if he did not have a very large sum of money—that he would measure his improvements according to what he had in interest and build up to it.

Mr. NELSON. We are not requesting any larger sum of money, but just that the Government will receive protection by requiring a less percentage from the soldier.

Mr. VAILE. Let me ask this question: Is this suggestion based on the experience of the Soldier Settlement Board in Tennessee?

Mr. NELSON. This is a suggestion made by the Soldier Settlement Board at a regular meeting.

Mr. VAILE. Is that based on their experience in cases of soldiers—that suggestion outlined there?

Mr. NELSON. We have never had any soldiers' settlements. It is just based on the experience of knowing what it costs to buy live stock in Tennessee and what it costs to make improvements, in the way of building farm dwellings, barns, and fences.

Mr. VAILE. Have you any provision—did you have any provision for the settlement of ex-Confederate soldiers on the land in Tennessee?

Mr. NELSON. I don't think so. I am not positive about that.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Nelson, did I understand you to say that your board estimated that the maximum amount there provided for buildings and live stock would be necessary to properly equip the soldiers?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir. We did. We consider it would take \$1,600 to equip in buildings any soldier farm, and that it would take at least \$1,200 to equip in live stock.

Mr. BARBOUR. I just wanted to be certain that I understood you correctly.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have given this matter quite extensive consideration, and you appeared before our committee in the last Congress. Will you state briefly to the committee the position of the State of Tennessee upon this matter and what you are doing down there?

Mr. NELSON. Well, Tennessee, I think, has taken the lead in the Southern States. When the matter was first mentioned by Secretary Lane last year, Tennessee immediately took an active interest, and an unofficial committee was appointed by the Nashville Commercial Club. This committee was composed of men from every section of the State, and they immediately made a survey of the State and considered the type of soil, the price of land, and after going into each section, decided that the Cumberland Plateau was the most desirable place for a soldier's settlement. So they had one of their members, Mr. Welch, appointed trustee, and options were taken in his name on about 150,000 acres of land, ranging in price from \$5 to \$15 an acre, and these lands were surveyed and complete maps were made of the whole project.

We sent committees to Washington last February, and they appeared before your committee and assisted in every way we could in recommending for passage the Taylor bill, as it was then known.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, the State is enthusiastically in favor of it, is it?

Mr. NELSON. The State, as a whole, is very enthusiastically in favor of it, and the legislature last January passed a bill giving the governor authority to appoint a committee and appropriating a small amount of money to finish up the work of this committee and to see that everything possible was done to further this plan.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no question but what the State of Tennessee will heartily cooperate with the Government in legislation of this kind?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; we want to cooperate to the fullest extent, and the suggestions are not made in the way of criticizing the bill, but in the hope that more soldiers will be able to avail themselves of the plan, and that it will be to the benefit of the soldier to make these changes.

Mr. MAYS. What character of land do you find in Tennessee will be available?

Mr. NELSON. I am not a soil expert. I am a geologist, so I think it would be better for a soil expert to answer that. But the land is a clay land with, I suppose it would be called, a sandy clay soil.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it cut-over land, swamp land, or what?

Mr. NELSON. Cut-over land, gently undulating. The elevation is about 1,800 feet, fine water, fine living conditions, good railroad facilities, and close to market.

Mr. MAYS. Did you find comparatively large tracts?

Mr. NELSON. We found tracts from probably 20,000 acres down to two or three hundred acres—all mixed up. There are some large holdings by lumber companies, some small holdings by people that have bought land and cultivated part of it, and by people who have bought more than they could cultivate. I would be glad to read a letter from one or two of the men that are in that vicinity, if you would like to have it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are confident, are you, that the Government, through the cooperation of the States, will get these lands at what they are worth, or at least not any more than they are worth, and that there will be no real estate imposition of any kind?

Mr. NELSON. We had that trouble when we started. We found there were some real estate men trying to make something out of it, and we did away with that immediately by taking options in the name of the trustee and refusing to have anything to do with people who had optioned their lands to real estate men. We went into other sections and got land directly from the owners.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a State matter, then?

Mr. NELSON. It is a State matter through the official State committee, and there will be no profiteering of any kind in the lands that have been submitted.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Nelson, I would like to ask about what acreage you think would be proper for these farms in Tennessee.

Mr. NELSON. Well, that is a question for an agricultural man again.

Mr. MAYS. Well, you have given a figure here of about \$2,000 for cost of the land, I believe.

Mr. NELSON. Well, that would be a basis, I suppose, of a 30 or 40 acre farm. Now, I don't know what size farms they intend to give the soldiers. I had to use some basis in making a figure, and I just took a \$2,000 basis as about the smallest basis that could be taken.

Mr. MAYS. I wanted to know what acreage would be necessary for them to properly support themselves and families on a Tennessee farm.

Mr. NELSON. It would be better for them to have a larger acreage.

Mr. MAYS. About what acreage?

Mr. NELSON. I should say from 80 to 100 acres.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Mondell brought out the fact that these applicants were presumed—would be presumed—to help in the improvement of their farms and make their first payment in that way, and the same in regard to the buildings. Would that modify your views in regard to the percentage to be paid in the beginning by the soldier, the fact that he would be allowed to work part of this out instead of paying cash?

Mr. NELSON. Well, if he did work it out, in order to get the maximum loan from the Government in every case, he has got to put up, as I understand it, the cash payment, and that would be \$533 on his live stock and \$600 on his improvements.

Mr. MAYS. On the live stock that is true, but when it would come to buildings Mr. Mondell pointed out that he would be permitted to help in the construction of buildings, and in hauling material and things of that kind, and make his payments on the buildings largely in that way, and in fencing the land he could also help pay it.

Mr. NELSON. The Government is going to lend him \$1,200 for his improvements, if that does not exceed three-quarters of the cost of the improvements. In other words, he would have to put up \$400.

Mr. MAYS. In labor it might be.

Mr. NELSON. Well, I don't know whether he could put it up in labor. As I understood it, that would have to be a cash payment. Now, if the Government would accept preferred payments in labor, in lieu of the \$400, that might make a difference in the improvements.

Mr. MAYS. That is what I wanted to know, if that would change your percentage.

Mr. NELSON. It might change it, but all the Government wants is protection from the soldier, and 10 per cent will protect the Government on any improvements, and 20 per cent of the total cost of any live stock bought will protect the Government on live stock.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Nelson, Mr. Mondell was also of the opinion that the amount stated, \$1,600, as a maximum for buildings, and \$1,300, I believe, and something—\$1,333—for equipment of live stock, was excessive; that they would not require that much; that the buildings, satisfactory buildings, might be constructed for six or seven or eight hundred dollars, and three or four hundred dollars might cover their equipment—do you think that would give a soldier a good start in the way of buildings and equipment, that amount of investment?

Mr. NELSON. In Tennessee—I am only speaking from the Tennessee standpoint—

Mr. BARBOUR (interposing). I realize that.

Mr. NELSON. In the section where this project is located, in order to build a satisfactory barn, a farm residence, fences, it would take that \$1,600. I don't see how he could possibly buy the necessary live stock for less than \$1,200. If he gets a span of mules, a cow, and a brood sow, he wouldn't have much money left.

Mr. BARBOUR. He would need certain implements, too.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; he would have to get his implements, too.

Mr. BARBOUR. That same thought occurred to me during the course of these arguments.

Mr. NELSON. We studied the matter very thoroughly and did not make the suggestion until we had gone over the cost and talked with people in that section. We had one member on our committee that used to live in that very section. Before we finally decided to make these recommendations, we went over the situation with people that were living in that section at the present time.

Mr. BARBOUR. My opinion is that the first question a soldier is going to ask us when he starts to consider this proposition is how much money he will have to put up.

Mr. NELSON. Well, now, of course under the present plan, he can put up \$1,033, and it is most probable that in order to get a good start, a satisfactory start, he would have to put that amount of money up. Under the suggested plan, in order to get the same amount of money from the Government he would put up \$500 and the Government would have adequate protection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Nelson, isn't this the idea: We don't expect the boys to come around with \$1,000 in their pockets, but we do expect them to come around with their muscle and ready to go to work, and if the Government, for instance, enters in a contract with them that they shall do a certain amount of work for a certain amount of money, or even a day's pay, or whatever the arrangement is, they will be allowed to earn the money or do enough work to give them this advance? Isn't that the idea? We don't want to fix it so that it will shut them out.

Mr. NELSON. No, that is my very idea in making the suggestions that it would not shut out the soldier, and the Government would still be protected. The Government doesn't want to shut out any soldier, and doesn't want to do anything but receive protection, as I gather it, from the soldier.

Mr. BARBOUR. As I understand Mr. Taylor's question, if the Government is willing to accept the soldier's labor at a certain value in lieu of coin, that would answer your objection, wouldn't it?

Mr. NELSON. How is the soldier going to live and support his family?

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, I don't know how he would support his family.

Mr. TAYLOR. Those that haven't got families, of course, some of them have, but there are two or three ways of looking at it. For instance, if you would start the boys at working at \$4 per day, they might, as has been suggested by Brother Kent—they might have their land paid for, and not have very much turned in on the whole business at that rate. We have got to get some results, you know, in clearing and work, and I don't think that the amount is so important as it is that we make some arrangement whereby they can go ahead and do the work and be given an allowance for it, and guarantee the Government, and yet get results. That is what we want. We want them to do some work there.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, but if it goes out that a soldier had to pay, either in wages on deferred payment, or in cash, \$1,000, roughly, in order to avail himself of this plan, I think it would hurt the plan.

Mr. TAYLOR. We don't want to make it prohibitive.

Mr. BARBOUR. Suppose the Secretary of the Interior, who, I understand, will be given wide discretionary powers in this matter, lays down a rule that a soldier working on one of these projects shall receive a certain wage, and that if he has a family there would be allotted to that family at least as much as was allotted to the soldier's family during his service in the Army, or even more, out of his wages; wouldn't that be satisfactory?

Mr. NELSON. Well, from the soldiers that I have talked to that have been over in France and have been in the country here, that have had allotments sent home, and when they paid Government insurance, that these soldiers have not any money.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is true; but they will be saving a certain amount of their wages, which will be applied on their land. That will be a direct saving.

Mr. NELSON. Why do you feel they will do that, when they haven't done it in the last two or three years?

Mr. BARBOUR. The Government will do it for them, maybe. The Secretary of the Interior will evolve a plan by which that can be done.

Mr. NELSON. Of course, I don't know anything about that.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; I don't either; but I am just trying to get information.

Mr. NELSON. If such a plan as that could be worked out, I think it would be very satisfactory.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Nelson, you have had some experience in handling land and seeing that men purchased this land for the purpose of farming in your part of the State?

Mr. NELSON. My experience in land has been confined to this settlement work, and the settlement work has been confined to the last 8 or 12 months—since this matter came up. I am the State geologist of Tennessee, and my work is mining work—in developing the mineral resources—but I took an interest in this matter because I felt it was one of the important matters coming after the war.

Mr. BENHAM. Have you lived any considerable part of your life on a farm?

Mr. NELSON. I have lived in the mountains and I have lived on the Cumberland Plateau several years, in the section that is under consideration—not continuously, but for several months at a time.

Mr. BENHAM. I mean in connection with the farming industry or mineral industry?

Mr. NELSON. In connection with the mineral industry. The suggestions that I am making are made by the board, and I was requested to present them. One of the members of the board, Dr. F. M. McRee, is commissioner of agriculture of Tennessee, a man who is about 70 years old and has been a farmer all his life; and another member, Dr. H. A. Morgan, one of the foremost agricultural experts in the South, in charge of the Tennessee Experimental Station, Bureau of Extension. The other two members on the committee are Mr. Welch, who has been a timberman, a lumberman, in the past, and Mr. Will Manier, a business man, and myself, a mining man. That is the personnel of the committee, and the committee as a whole has made these suggestions.

Mr. RAKER. From your observations, now, you find that the Southern States are practically in favor of this kind of legislation?

Mr. NELSON. I think they are; yes. I think that practically, with one or two minor exceptions, the whole South is very greatly in favor of this legislation.

Mr. RAKER. From what you have observed in regard to this question, would you provide a completed farm—I use the word “completed” to generally describe it—and turn it over to the soldier, or sell it to him—call it his homestead—or would you provide them a home to live in, a house, a few of the necessary buildings, a barn, a chicken house, and a few other necessary outbuildings upon part of his land, cleared where it can be done with cooperation or otherwise individually, and then allow him to work out the balance him-

self in degrees, so that he would have, in addition to his cultivation, something to work on for the next eight or ten years?

Mr. NELSON. Well, I don't think that I am competent to answer that question.

Mr. RAKER. All right, then; I thought maybe you had given it some consideration.

Mr. NELSON. I will say that the committee had given this consideration. The members of the committee in discussion seemed to think that it would be better to turn a practically completed farm over to the soldier, probably with a very small percentage of the farm to be cleared after it is turned over.

Mr. RAKER. You don't know upon what theory they base that, do you?

Mr. NELSON. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That is really a change of thought from all our experience for the last 50 years in this country.

Mr. NELSON. That was just the individual opinion of the members of the committee—the agricultural members of the Tennessee committee. Of course, they suggested this, that it might not be necessary for a man to have all of his improvements on the farm when it was turned over to him; that those could be built in the next year or two.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask if you have made any investigation as to the segregated proposition?

Mr. NELSON. As to the what?

Mr. WHITE. The segregated unit. That is, as it has been discussed here, giving the soldier an opportunity to buy a farm, the Government cooperating with him, outside of what has been designated as a community project.

Mr. NELSON. You mean buying an individual farm?

Mr. WHITE. Buy him an individual farm; yes.

Mr. NELSON. Well, I have read something of such plans. I think that was tried in Australia. In places where the plan has been tried it has not been a success. They have not been able to keep up with the settlers that they have placed.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you if you think there are numerous opportunities, or would there be frequent opportunities, where the proposition could be successfully carried out in your State?

Mr. NELSON. By taking individual farms not connected?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. I don't think it could, because the farmers in many sections are using methods that are not improved. They are farming like they did 50 years ago, and if you would place a new man in such a community he might try to use improved methods for a short time, but he would very probably fall back into the rut that is being followed by everyone surrounding him.

Mr. WHITE. Well, aren't there many localities in your State where they are using the improved progressive methods?

Mr. NELSON. Where they are being used, the lands, I think, are too high to be procured under this act. The cost of the land is too high.

Mr. RAKER. There is always on the part of the Government sort of a paterfamilias of this soldier, watching his farming, isn't there?

Mr. NELSON. No; but the committee thought that in a large project that it would certainly need an agricultural expert there at all times

for consultation on any point that might come up, just like the Tennessee University has agricultural experimental stations in every section of the State. They would have an agricultural agent for that section that could be called upon whenever he was needed.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nelson, you may have stated it, but I did not get it if you did—what is the average price at which you can secure these lands that you contemplate securing?

Mr. NELSON. The options that we have taken ranged from \$5 to \$15 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. And what will it cost to clear those lands? I understand that some of them are in stumps.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; I can't tell you what the cost would be now. I can state that the N., C. & St. L. Railway several years ago cleared up a 40-acre farm on the Plateau, and their figures for clearing that were about, I think, \$40 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that very heavily timbered?

Mr. NELSON. Well, all of that land on the Plateau is about the same.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the character of the timber?

Mr. NELSON. Mainly oak; different varieties of oak. They are hardwoods.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many feet it runs to the acre?

Mr. NELSON. I couldn't say.

Mr. TAYLOR. If it is cut-over land, it hasn't got very many feet to the acre, has it?

Mr. NELSON. Most all of the large timber has practically been cut off. There is small timber there.

Mr. WHITE. Would the land require fertilizing before it could be successfully available?

Mr. NELSON. It would require liming. It may require other things. I could not stand that, but I know they use lime in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. What process did the railroad use to remove the stumps, do you know?

Mr. NELSON. I could not say. I think they pulled one tree against the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions of Mr. Nelson? If not, we thank you very much.

Now, I should like to get some idea as to how many more witnesses we will have, in order to see whether we can not close these hearings by Friday at the latest. We have Mr. Davis, of the Reclamation Service, and the Governor of Oklahoma was to be here to-day, as I understood it.

Mr. VAILE. And Mr. Atkeson again, if he desires to appear.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. And Gov. Gooding, of Idaho, and several members from the State have signified their desire to appear before the committee. I think it might be well to assign Friday to the Members of Congress.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Kent, a former member of this committee, is here. Do you wish to make a statement, Mr. Kent?

Mr. KENT. I will make one if you wish me to.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear you now, then. You might tell the committee just whom you represent and give your name.

**STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM KENT, OF THE UNITED STATES
TARIFF COMMISSION.**

MR. KENT. I was formerly a Member of Congress, from 1911 to 1917. Since then I have been a member of the United States Tariff Commission. I was a member of this committee for four years, and I have been deeply interested in land and land problems all my life, and I have had the benefit of sitting in with Dr. Meade, who is the main author of this bill, who is undoubtedly the greatest land-settlement expert in this country, and probably in any country. He is a man who had for nine years worked out the land-settlement policy of Australia and is now just finishing allotments in a plan in California along these lines, and I am sorry that the committee can not avail themselves of his presence. If you have time, I should think it would be the best thing to do to send for him and let him make a statement.

Now, this bill, I am going to criticize certain features of it, although I am very much in favor of the legislation—the general idea.

In the first place, the question of land settlement is so much bigger than any soldier proposition that I am sorry you put the cart before the horse. I am sorry that the legislation did not bear the caption of "A bill for land settlement or redistribution of population with preference to those who have served in the war," instead of starting out with it as an aid to soldiers. The worst economic feature of our country, to my mind—and a bad social feature—is the overgrowth of the cities, which are a burden on production. The same thing is true of even the smaller towns. We are getting away from production, and we are putting too many people into the cities and into the towns—we are paying too much for distribution. There must be a redistribution of population.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kent, before going further, it might be well for you to tell the committee what experience you have had in farming and in raising live stock and kindred subjects.

MR. KENT. For over 30 years I was engaged in cattle feeding and farming in Nebraska on a large scale. For the same length of time, and up to two years ago I owned a big ranch in Nevada. Both were considerable institutions. Although I don't believe in it, I have played the game of land speculation in about 14 States, and I am free to confess that I have reaped where I have not sown and have had pretty good luck. So I am more or less familiar with farm conditions all over the country and with the land problem.

If you start toward the redistribution of population, you are starting on the right and permanent track; you are doing what you want to do for the soldier when you give him full preference, but you don't bar other people. If the soldier can do this work that you think he is fit to do, that is all right; on the other hand, if you start out only with soldier relief, the time is going to come when the soliders will be very apt to think that they are a privileged class as against other people. You have seen some of that spirit in the past, this soldier privilege, and while we want to do the gracious and grateful thing for the soldier, we don't want to have the soldier to get the idea that he is to inherit the earth as against other people that could properly use it. He should be given preference rather than to have the

thing back to the land assistance entirely confined to him. After all the soldier is a citizen and every citizen is a potential soldier.

A very important part of this bill is the section which provides that these lands can not be alienated from the settler for 10 years. Ten years is better than nothing, but a million years would be still better. I can not see how you are going to hold settlers on land and continue to be certain of continuing work on land, and production on land, if you put this land under an absolute title that a man can part with. This is just ordinary sense if you try to figure out how you are going to avoid farm tenancy and how you are going to have the land fully and permanently worked. You will find that parting with full title, throwing it into the speculative class of investment, where a man can go off and leave it untilled, or run up the price on the next fellow, is not going to accomplish your result.

Take the reclamation in the West—Mr. Davis will, no doubt, bear me out there—of course, the idea there was to provide for the settler. I don't think the method by which the settler was cared for was entirely judicious. I don't think there was nearly enough done to put the land in shape so that the man could go ahead and begin producing, and thereby make himself solid. There were a tremendous lot of miserable failures, or unnecessary suffering, that came from not staking the man, as he is staked under the terms of this bill.

But I want to call your attention to another fact, and that is while Congress was legislating for the settler, providing an opportunity for him to a measurable extent, at the same time there went along the buying out of settlers, cultivated areas by large owners, especially large cattle men. In the Truckee-Carson project, which certainly was established for settlers, and to give people of moderate means a better chance, I am informed that the largest cattle people in Nevada have purchased considerable tracts of the best land.

The CHAIRMAN. That is on a Government reclamation project?

Mr. KENT. Yes, sir. The Truckee-Carson project. That land has been purchased by Humphrey & Moffitt, the cattlemen. I understand they have considerable areas of the very best land in that project, and that project certainly never was created for that purpose. Humphrey & Moffitt had plenty of land to go out on and do their own reclaiming and not use Government money without interest, which is, in effect, what happened on these projects.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. They purchased it from the settlers?

Mr. KENT. They purchased it from the settlers. The settlers were allowed to sell, and in some cases they did sell, and we have a resumption of large holdings in there, which is not what we wanted. If any place in the world needs self-sustaining families, it is the State of Nevada. There is a comparatively small area available for such purposes, and I am informed that this process is going on.

Now, I am informed that in Idaho one of the projects there—Mr. Meade told me this—I can't give you the name of the project in detail—that in one of the projects there, there have been very large purchases by wealthy interests of the best lands in the projects. And again your settler gets out; your State is impoverished in the quality of its population.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will you be a little more explicit with reference to your statement concerning Idaho?

Mr. KENT. I can't be any more explicit.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I know of no such condition as that referred prevailing on Government reclamation projects in my State.

Mr. KENT. There is none?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. KENT. Well, Dr. Meade told me so.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The farms are really being divided, instead of falling into the hands of corporations or large holders.

Mr. RAKER. How is that?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The irrigated lands are being divided up because it has been discovered that 160 acres of irrigated land is oftentimes too large to farm advantageously.

Mr. KENT. Well, I wish you would inquire of Mr. Davis on that specific question. I only roughly quote what Dr. Mead told me, that there had been this tendency, and I am definitely informed that Humphrey & Moffit have large amounts of the Truckee-Carson project.

Mr. RAKER. Right there, Mr. Kent—the only reason that they got it, if they got any, during this last year under this legislation, irrigated land, was that they owned it before. That is the trouble under these projects, that the people owned the land before the project was inaugurated, but under the law you can only have 160 acres. I agree with you on that, and I am going to offer an amendment to this legislation that a man can only have one homestead under the project.

Mr. KENT. The serious feature is that this homestead once acquired falls into the speculative class. You have no certainty that the land is going to be worked. New South Wales adopted the limited title scheme, and it worked successfully there, and I think it should be embodied in this legislation. I have no idea that it will be, and indeed I could not expect to see such a great question taken up in this particular emergency. I wish you would lengthen the time from 10 years to 20 years, if you can, in which that land can not be alienated, and wait for the people hereafter to work out the general scheme of land tenure.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Kent, may I ask you a question? Do you not think it would be wise to amend the bill, providing that the transfer should only be made to a soldier? Because there are many circumstances that arise which make it impossible for a man to go ahead with his farming activities.

Mr. KENT. As I started out to say, Mr. Smith, I think the mistake is made in making the soldier the sole beneficiary here.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What will you do with the man who loses his health and is unable to keep on with his payments?

Mr. KENT. Under the plan I propose, I would credit him with everything that he has put on the land, and if you have a limited tenure—I am talking now about the scheme that I am figuring on—if you have a limited tenure and the time came when a man had to get off, owing to ill health, or for other reason, he would have for sale everything that he had contributed to the land, less what he owed on the land. The idea would be for him to have only for sale that which he had contributed, and I would either guarantee that the Government would take the property off his hands, or permit him to sell to some other qualified farmer.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. To some soldier?

Mr. KENT. Well, you are confining this to soldiers. I think it is unfortunate. I would give the soldier the preference, but I would aim the bill to the end of a general redistribution of population. There are thousands of men being wasted in the cities, who would make the best of agriculturalists, men that love the land and could make a great success on it, but under our system they get into the cities and stay there, and there is no means of getting them out. If you do get people out on the land, the only way to hold them on the land, to keep them from selling speculating, and getting off the land is to retain part of the title in the State or the Federal Government.

Then you have an assurance that the land will be occupied. This sort of title would carry with it the right of inheritance, with a reasonable length of time for the heirs to show that they would work the land. If they could not work the land, they ought to have to sell it. The land ought to be kept busy by some one or other. The only way I can see to keeping it busy is to keep it out of the speculative class of investment. You are only adding another limit to the terms of tenure anyway, because you have got tax laws respecting title to all lands. In the State of Maine they tell a man how he can cut timber on his own property. You have countless limitations on this so-called fee simple title, and you can call this another limitation on the same thing, or you can call it a partial title. But to me this question of title is the most important thing of the lot.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Kent, doesn't the plan that you are now suggesting virtually make the Government a landlord and the settler a tenant instead of a home owner?

Mr. KENT. Well, that of course—in a sense, the State or the Government, whichever retains part of the title, is the landlord. I don't see any hardship about that. A man knows what the terms are going to be for a long period ahead. He can be taxed out of existence anyway, and his tenure can be curtailed in many ways. The mere fact that he has something to sell doesn't make him more or less a home owner than he would be if he knew that he could stay there and his children after him, as long as the land is worked.

Mr. MAYS. Would you make this partial title subject to taxation?

Mr. KENT. That is a matter of adjustment of rental of land and ownership of improvements.

Mr. MAYS. And in case he should not pay the taxes, what would you do then with the title?

Mr. KENT. Well, that question of taxation would go directly up to the State. My idea would be that the State should retain this title and take a certain amount of rental for a period of 10 years, subject to readjustment at the end of 10 years. That would be in lieu of taxes and out of that the Government would have to get its portion or there would have to be separate payments made to the Government in addition to that rental. That would be the idea. I only make that suggestion, and, as I say, the only thing that I could hope or ask of you gentlemen would be to extend the period in which the land could not be alienated, and, as Mr. Raker suggests, provide against large holdings.

MR. TAYLOR. You think we ought to revert to the policy that we originally had a year ago, making it open to everybody instead of to soldiers only?

MR. KENT. I think you ought to make it open to everybody, but give the soldier the preference. There would be lots of cases where no soldier would want to avail himself of it.

MR. TAYLOR. I think Secretary Lane's thought was to pass this bill primarily to give the soldier the right to come in and take advantage of this law, and then at the expiration of a year or so, if there were not sufficient soldiers to take up all that the Government had provided for, that the appropriation authorized the Interior Department then to take care of other people. I think that was his idea, but to start off by letting the soldiers feel that we were doing something for them.

MR. KENT. I think you are heading in the wrong direction.

MR. RAKER. The trouble right now is the legislative and the practical proposition that if we made this general, Mr. Kent, and said that even in a year we are going to open it up, I am wondering whether or not we could get it through the two Houses.

MR. KENT. The point is that you get exactly the same practical result if you say this is a bill for general redistribution of population and in aid of settlement, with full preference for soldiers. You are giving the soldier all he will get anyway, but you would then be starting in the right way, whereas if you start and say, "This is a soldier bill, and the soldier is the only fellow who will have a chance under this legislation," you are creating a privileged class out of the soldiers.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. Do you not think, Mr. Kent, the soldier is entitled to be placed in a privileged class?

MR. KENT. Yes; and he is, in fact, with it the other way, but you would not start another lot of people in this country to thinking they are different from other people, and are entitled to things that other people are not entitled to. Give them the first chance, certainly.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. What do you think of the suggestion to provide that for three years soldiers should have a preference right, and at the end of that time any land that is left unapplied for should be opened up to the civilian population?

MR. KENT. I think that would be better than the way you have it. I don't think it makes any practical difference, but I fear that you are heading the wrong way, creating, perhaps 20 years from now, a demand on the part of the soldier: "I must be recognized as against everybody else," and I don't think we ought to be doing that. This is for immediate care of the soldier, and at the end of 20 years he ought not to be able to say, "I am the only man that can be assisted by the Government under this policy as it was started."

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kent, do you think this plan could be made feasible in the Eastern and Northern States as well as the West and South?

MR. KENT. I think—my talks with Dr. Mead and my looking around the country has satisfied me that Massachusetts is probably one of the best fields. I have seen some of the work there myself. Mr. Charles R. Crane bought a very large tract and has had great success there in clearing and cultivating and renting, and he is will-

ing to turn his big investment, after proving it successful, over to the Government practically at cost. I think that New Jersey has immense tracts of land. Virginia has lots of land that is well adapted to this purpose. There is a vast area of land lying outdoors in North and South Carolina and Georgia, where there is adequate rainfall, good drainage, and everything but soil fertility. The land is easily broken and worked, but the whole thing there is lack of soil fertility, and that can be supplied by right cropping and live stock.

I think, looking at the country as a whole, that the greatest benefit that can come from this policy will be in cooperation in these Eastern States where you are right next to a great hungry market, instead of putting the emphasis where you have these immensely long freight hauls. The big benefit will come from State and private cooperation right down here in this part of the country, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Just another question, Mr. Kent. Referring to your idea that this legislation should be more comprehensive and that the beneficiary should not be limited to soldiers, have you given any thought to the legal question as to whether or not we could predicate such legislation as this on anything else but the war power?

Mr. KENT. It never occurred to me that you could not. Irrigation settlements, by analogy, have had absolutely nothing to do with war power. Then there is the California settlement, which certainly had no connection with the war power.

The CHAIRMAN. That was State settlement. I recall, Mr. Kent—it may refresh your mind—some question was raised as to whether or not the Government could enter upon any reclamation projects except where the public lands were concerned.

Mr. KENT. Well, you mean in cooperation with the States? Of course, if the Government buys land of private individuals it becomes Government land—no question about that—but the immediate idea was that the greater amount of State cooperation you would have the better the management of the whole thing would be, and the better it would fit into local conditions. Dr. Mead placed great emphasis on the need of State cooperation in handling these things.

Now, you have, then, the question as to whether the Government could expend money in cooperation with the States on land owned by the States. Well, I have never heard anybody discuss the question as to whether the Government could spend money in the State of Tennessee in improving the Mississippi River, have you? It seems to me that I have not heard of any constitutional or legal objection being made to the Government spending money in the States. Does that answer your question?

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to get your ideas on it. I did not want to go into it at length.

Mr. KENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have gone into this matter very carefully and have here copies of pamphlets entitled, one of them, "Getting Men Back on the Land"; also another, "Discussion of Land Tenure and Public Policy." They may or may not interest the members of the committee.

Mr. ELSTON. Are there enough there for distribution to the members of the committee?

Mr. KENT. Yes. If not, anybody that wants one may have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you ask to have them inserted in the record?

I would suggest, if agreeable to the committee, that the land-settlement pamphlet, being complete and closely reasoned, might be printed in your record.

(Following is Mr. Kent's essay delivered at the labor reconstruction conference, Academy of Political Sciences, New York, December 7, 1918:)

GETTING MEN BACK ON THE LAND.

The war and its consequent disturbance of our industry has brought before us in accentuated form a problem that has long been growing—the proper distribution of our people. As compared with rural communities, the cities have had a tremendous relative increase. Few of us have appreciated the bane of their overgrowth. The chief functions of the cities are dual—to assemble labor for manufacturing production, and to serve the purposes of distribution.

The labor-saving device of propinquity is carried to such an extreme as to rescatter the assembled people throughout suburban areas. Traffic congestion necessitates surface, overhead, and underground communication, until the expense of the Panama Canal sinks into insignificance when compared with that of the intramural transportation of New York; while inflated property values and rents in accordance, are a perpetual burden.

No one could have conceived such an aggregation of waste as they afford, and yet their social attractions cause the moths to seek the candle, their sheer mass seems to create a power like that of gravitation. They defy all principles of supply and demand. Men needed elsewhere, and superfluous in the cities, find means for forcing a livelihood in the excess population. Somehow or other they create a place for themselves and become a burden upon necessary production. A census of urban population ministering to the useless and extravagant elements of city life would comprise a large portion of city dwellers. Even the mechanics engaged in enlarging the overgrown cities are wasting time and material.

The waste is largely of human material. During years of vast immigration influx, the cities have absorbed and misapplied the services of millions of people who left rural employment in Europe and found here no outlet for their trained capacity. To the cities and towns have gone many of the most vigorous and energetic of our native rural population.

Country life has been dull and lonely, and latterly only those with considerable means need apply with expectation of reasonable independence.

Every undeserved accretion of urban population means advancing land values, and wasteful employment in serving the needs of ill-placed and unproductive people, who are either doing the wrong thing, or doing the right thing in the wrong place.

On this account our per capita food supplies have steadily diminished, despite our vast land areas, and upon the food supply must rest our national permanence and prosperity.

The spread between prices received by the farmer and paid by the consumer has not been reduced by our boasted methods of distribution and intermediate handling, but instead has increased.

Simpler forms of packing have been superseded by the costly can and carton. Monopoly has taken a large mouthful, and neither public nor private agencies have sufficiently sought to save waste, or to fill void areas from areas of surplus.

The tide of population must be turned. It can not be turned except to lands now uncultivated. Our coming farmers must be assured of adequate reward for well directed effort, and must find in the farmer's life, from day to day, such social conditions as afford a satisfactory answer to the great riddle: "What are we here for?"

We have been moving West in our agricultural operations. The theory of the "margin of cultivation" has been at work, but the tendency to abandon farms near to great markets has been due to other factors—to bad farming, bad marketing, lack of credit and capital, and to unnecessary soil depletion. Parallel with this abandonment we find sporadic patches producing profitable yields under intensive truck gardening and small fruit culture, showing how far the abandoned areas are really above the "margin."

The pioneer conditions under which our Northern Atlantic States were settled were hard, but the settlers' demands for many things that are now con-

sidered necessities were small. Food and clothing and a small surplus for barter were secured under primitive agricultural methods, with little capital and much labor.

In the South the institution of slavery and the heedless depletion of soil fertility due to farming methods and to the soil strain of the staple crops, cotton and tobacco, caused a continuing migration to virgin or more fertile lands, as insistent demand for fresh slave territory which finally caused the Civil War. The utter impoverishment of the South and the unfamiliarity of the white man with manual labor were supplemented by the backwardness of the negro.

Throughout the expanse of the abandoned and undeveloped portions of the South Atlantic States are examples of the wonderful production to be obtained on lands, which, though often initially infertile, possess the advantage of long seasons, adequate rainfall, and good drainage.

The cut-over areas of the North-Central and Northwestern States often possess soil fertility, but the problem of digging out stumps and clearing by the unaided toil of the individual, offers an appalling vista of unproductive years. We have never taken sufficiently into account the loss incident to the time taken by manual labor to clear and subdue farm lands. It is simple to show the slowly increasing production that goes on with acre by acre clearing and with the soul-destroying irritation of plowing amidst stumps.

The irrigation areas vary in productivity. However rosy may be the prospect of crops insured against drought and often climatically exempt from frost damage, there is little that is cheering to the settler without capital. Oftentimes he has invested his all in his initial payment. Without adequate housing, without horses, he faces the unbroken sagebrush and the unlevelled land. His pitiful efforts with hand tools are interspersed with working for wages, till often broken in pocket and spirit, he abandons fertile soil with water at hand because he can not make the connection of natural resources where capital or credit is lacking. Grubbing sagebrush with a mattock is a criminal waste of life when a tractor will tear out and break eight acres a day. While many successes have been recorded there is throughout the West the remembrance of countless tragic and unnecessary failures, with the prospect of many more, until the time comes that settlement means application of labor directly to production and not the mere placing of a human body on a fenced piece of land.

It is trite to state that agricultural production calls for land, labor, and capital, but to most of us it has not been so clear that the necessary ingredients are needed in widely divergent ratios. Prairie farming has called for much land and comparatively little labor or capital. It has been subject to extreme costs between production and consumption. These costs may be largely remedied, but there will always be required comparatively long hauls and expensive freight charges to reach foreign markets or the largest centers of American population.

Truck gardening near the market requires little land, small capital, and immense labor, with no inherently heavy charge for selling, but a considerable risk on account of the perishable nature of the produce.

Fruit growing calls for varying amounts of land and labor, but for considerable capital to await production and great risk from natural causes and often from the uncertainties of market conditions.

The prairie lands yielding cheaply staple grains and live stock are practically all taken up.

Future development must be found in reclamation of various sorts. There still remain portions of the arid public domain where irrigation may be promoted. This involves large capital investment.

There are areas that can be reclaimed from swamps, with varying costs, which must be met wholesale. But chiefly to be relied on for extent are the abandoned lands and the unused lands of the East and the cut-over lands of the South and of the Northwest.

The problem in each case is to secure and economically to apply the large capital fund necessary to make land immediately productive.

In some cases water must be supplied; in some cases drainage must be obtained. Here we must clear off stumps and brush, and there we must supply and develop soil fertility.

The problems of settlement involve doing these things with machinery, doing them rapidly, and on an immense scale.

The lands of greatest fertility, where the least capital and labor are required for production, have increased tremendously in selling value.

Under our fee simple tenure there is in some places a continuing tendency to aggregate into large holdings farmed by hired labor or by tenants. Otherwise we find a breaking up of large speculative holdings, but everywhere an increase of private tenancy, which is an admitted menace to our social and economic welfare.

Whatever may be the abstract ethics of rent or interest charge, it is not well for people to live in idleness on the product of others. No restrictions of leases in private-tenant contracts can prevent wasteful, careless farming, with the natural tendency and temptation to soil depletion and heedlessness of upkeep that go with temporary and shifting occupation.

The policy of land settlement is far bigger than the immediate provision for soldiers and sailors. It should not be confined to war displacement. If opportunities are to be offered, there is justice in showing first preference for those who have risked their lives for the Republic, and then next to those whose occupations and employment have been overturned or destroyed by war emergency or its ending.

But there must be a redistribution and a procession "back to the land" whether soldiers and sailors wish to lead it or whether others shall avail themselves of the chances. Somewhere we must find those who by inclination and qualification are willing under favoring circumstances to undertake the task of increasing our food supply.

First, let us consider the question of inclination. It has long been recognized that farm life is hard and lonesome. Our prairies, largely held in quarter sections, placed people half a mile apart. The natural requirements of social life were denied them, and the town and city had an irresistible fascination. We have but to consider how wide a departure this is from the village rural life of Europe to see where the remedy must lie. We must more and more work toward community life, such as is now possible under the intensive farming of irrigation districts. Land holdings will normally tend to become smaller, with equal output, due to better methods, and community life must be given a proper development. The parcel post, the telephone, the cheap automobile, are all working toward closer association. Cooperative use of tractors, abandonment of useless fences with their waste patches and weed beds, and the use of the latest farming machinery will also urge this tendency in days to come. Scientific agriculture and technical education that makes it possible will, when coupled with community life, tend to stabilize farm life as a satisfactory and permanent career.

No settlement policy can be solvent unless it carefully discriminates in the selection of those who are to be given opportunity. They must be interested, able-bodied, capable, and qualified. Agriculture, no more than school teaching, is a proper recourse for tag-enders and failures. Settlers must be aided by the careful selection and preparation of land, and by advances of capital to bring such land into production, when supplemented by the settler's labor, and any policy not inherently solvent would be an intolerable burden and an element of evil to any country that tried it. Settlers must be taught what to do and how to do it, not out of books of theory, but from pages of actual local experience.

A careful study of the situation, of the large capital needed, and the narrow margin that should be charged for rendering the service of land settlement, leads to the view that it should not be left to private initiative. It is essentially a public service. There should be intimate cooperation between the States and the Nation in any land-settlement policy. It is true that such settlement might be carried through, as in the past, through irrigation and reclamation projects on portions of the public domain and entirely by the Federal Government, but these are necessarily subject to State taxation and to a measure of State control, without any definite cooperative agreement with the Nation.

The States could perform the service independently of the Federal Government, as California is now doing on a small scale. But the problem is one of national importance, to which the national credit should be lent, and a greater degree of uniformity could be assured through national supervision and assistance.

The State, with its well-defined taxing power, can best handle such questions as road building, where benefits should be assessed against the land profiting by improvements.

Funds expended in the States by the Federal Government are as a general matter spent and gone without possibility of recovery, as is evidenced in our river and harbor appropriations. Uncle Sam can pay damages, but can not assess benefits.

In the case of reclamation projects, Government expenditures are added to the per acre price of lands reclaimed, but there are often general benefits outside the reclaimed area which should be paid for by others than the specific settlers.

Any State with a self-respecting sense of its responsibilities and a desire for orderly progress would naturally better comprehend its immediate needs and conditions and better meet them than a centralized authority in distant Washington.

Let us turn for a moment to consider the question of farm credits. That question, as furnishing a productive agency, is not reached and hardly even approached in the United States, by any means, private or public. Benefit has accrued to farmers and investors by the creation of our land-credit system, which supplements the private agencies that have heretofore lent funds on mortgages. But lending money on mortgages bears the same relation to production in the agricultural field as does pawnbroking or collateral loans by banks in commercial transactions. The owner of the most available standard land, worth, perhaps, \$200 per acre, can easily borrow from private investors up to \$100 an acre. The funds may be used to buy more land, or for any other purpose, productive or otherwise. But consider the case of a borrower who would subdue a piece of brush land, worth \$5 an acre, or one who would plant to orchard land of small value, with the need of waiting years for returns that eventually would be large. Consider the case of one who, by years of cultivation and the use of expensive fertilizer, would make barren sand permanently productive.

There are innumerable cases where advance amounting to 10 times the value of the raw land involved would be paid out of but few intensive and valuable crops.

It is as necessary to furnish a credit system to meet such requirements as it is that banks should furnish credit for mercantile and manufacturing operations.

Mortgage loans at reasonable rates are a benefit, but in a sense offer an example of "To him that hath shall be given," and the tenant is hopelessly barred.

The machinery that will safeguard such productive credit has been created in other countries, and differs in no essential particular from the security obtained for mercantile advances. It is a question of organization of local units under a general system, so that eventually a comparatively small number of neighbors guarantee and watch each other, with the penalty of loss of future credit for delinquency.

Under an adequate plan of settlement these credit needs would be recognized at the outset. It is necessary to consider them to make the question of the needed element of capital clear.

As we enter the field of concrete illustration I urge as one of the most important factors in any system of settlement the question of the form of tenure upon which settlement should be based. We take for granted the evils of tenancy. We also take for granted the wrong that arises from withholding land from production, also unearned profits derived through land speculation. We also recognize clearly that society should demand not only full use of land, but undiminished and even increased productivity. We recognize that Government should prevent destruction as found in the millions of acres hopelessly eroded, most notably in some of the Southern States, and deliberately destroyed by gold dredging, as practiced in some of the most fertile and productive areas of California.

In accordance with the free and easy verbiage of royal tradition, we bestow land in fee simple, to "Richard Roe and to his heirs and assigns forever." This is indeed a full grant for a considerable period, if we take note of the formula. We next inform Richard that we propose to levy whatever taxes we see fit upon his property. We then inform him that as far as his heirs are concerned, they can, at his death, dispose of it at forced sale, and pay a part of the resultant proceeds to the State and another to the Nation. Some States compel him to cultivate and to eliminate weeds; others tell him how he shall cut his wood lot. Poor Richard is everywhere met with a denial of the high-sounding words of his title deed.

The limitations are neither coherent, uniform, or rational, nor do they touch the evils of tenancy or speculation.

Why should we not in our future planning avoid this process of giving, and subsequently taking away, by providing for permanent tenure under such conditions that make unnecessary this subsequent remedial control. There is one way in which it can be done, a way recognized in other countries, most notably in the Australian commonwealth and in New Zealand, and that is by giving a limited title at the beginning, subject to resumption by the State on violation of specific regulations.

Now let us see how our plan might work out. Let us say, that there can be found in the State of New Jersey a tract of 10,000 acres now lying waste, which, by the application of adequate capital, can in two or three years be made productive for qualified and selected settlers. Let the State of New Jersey buy that land at the lowest possible price. Thereafter the State should invite the Federal Government to look it over, and see whether it is of such a nature that the Nation will cooperate in its settlement. Once the Federal Government has accepted the project, then men and machinery should be put at work to clear, level, and to apply such elements to the soil as are needed for production. There would be no long drawn out misery of grubbing and clearing by hand, but less eventual cost per acre, and less time consumed in the process. The land being cleared and prepared, the Federal Government should provide funds for necessary buildings, with domicile either on the property itself or in a central village. The Federal Government should furthermore advance through co-operative local credit centers sufficient funds for needed personal property in farm implements and live stock. Before the settler goes on, it should be in such condition as to produce crops in the next growing season.

The settler, carefully selected and required to make at least a small payment for his holding, should thereafter be subject to pay to the State for a set period of not less than 20 years a fixed sum, as interest on the original purchase price—this to the State in lieu of land tax. That such interest payment might cover insurance for delinquencies and expenses, the rate should probably be 6 per cent. The settler would also be liable to the Government for amortization payments on personal property in not more than 10 annual installments, together with interest at 4 or 5 per cent. He should furthermore be liable to the Government for amortization payments on the cost of permanent improvements and clearing and putting the land in condition, which payments might run over a period of 30 to 40 years, at 4 to 5 per cent.

Permanency of tenure could be assured, subject to proper cultivation, although the fee simple title would not pass out of the State. The right of inheritance would be respected, subjecting the successor to the same as the devisee. A man could give his property, to anyone satisfactory to a local board composed of State and Federal representatives, but no one could secure this limited title without assurance that the individual who took it proposed to work the land under the restrictions set forth. Every safeguard should be placed around his tenure, as against the accidents of life, so that the occupant would feel secure, even through crop failure or other destructive hardship. If the settler desired for any cause to move from his land, he should be permitted to sell his contributions to the property to a person satisfactory to the board. In addition, this board should stand ready to repurchase the property in the event of no purchaser being immediately available, paying him all that he had contributed by amortization and by his own work. He should be paid the then value of improvements added by him, and the then value of improvements supplied by the Government, less the unpaid debt against them. He should be credited with added soil fertility and value of orchard at the time of removal. His allotment could then be again turned over at the sum ascertained to some one willing to carry out the conditions of his contract.

Here is a plan that eliminates a large part of the element of pioneer hardship and risk—a plan that makes land speculation impossible, and one that destroys private tenancy. It can be developed along lines that make rural life more attractive, and if carefully administered, it is above all a solvent plan that, while paying itself off out of product, is a permanent enrichment of the State and the country.

The speculation privilege, with the unconscionable profit derived from the needs and the breeding capacity of other people, is eliminated, but there is also eliminated at the other end the struggle and misery accompanied by tremendous percentage of failure, in cases where an individual tries to dig out a livelihood, under conditions unnecessary and even misunderstood, and where

he usually lacks the capital needed to make his effort count at the critical time, which is at the beginning.

As a final general idea, I wish to state that in my opinion the greatest need and the greatest possibility for such a settlement is near the Atlantic coast, where population is worst distributed, where millions of acres of available land is lying waste, and where the demands of a hungry market are close at hand. The difference between corn and wheat values between Omaha and New York are upward of 25 cents a bushel. It is an unmitigated absurdity, that with the eastern States preeminently qualified to raise the best of apples, we should be forced to secure our supplies by freight from distant Oregon. Almost any land will raise potatoes, which have been selling at prices unconsciously high.

The needed application of credit and labor can best be made by the cooperative effort of the States and Nation. Again, let me say that nothing excepting the retention of title by the State or the Nation can fend against the reaccumulation of developed areas into large holdings, with the recurrence of the evils of speculation and tenancy.

We are, after all, but tenants of the world and of the State. We may be deprived of life and liberty at the will of the Government of which we are a part. Are we wronged if in future agricultural settlement, where much of the element of risk is eliminated, and where immediate means of livelihood are supplied—if with such opportunity conferred—we are denied the privilege of profiting by the effort of others, and prevented from profiteering out of the common need for land?

MR. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a distinguished gentleman from Texas is here, and I think we have got time to hear him this morning—**Mr. Garner.**

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear him.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN N. GARNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS.

MR. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, if there are any gentlemen here from a distance who want to be heard, of course I do not care to take their time. The Texas delegation took seriously your suggestion that each delegation send some one down here to express their views, and that is why I am here.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear you.

MR. GARNER. I came around yesterday morning, and I saw some gentlemen from the West, and when there are gentlemen from out of town here who want to be heard, I think it is the duty of the Member of the House, that is here all the time, to stand aside until they are through.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Texas delegation had a conference at which all, I believe, except one, possibly, were there—he could not be there—and they asked me to come over and make suggestions as to the views of the Texas delegation as to giving assistance or relief, or whatever you may term it, to soldiers. If the purpose of this bill is to give relief to the soldiers, we don't believe that it will give the relief that has been suggested by the Interior Department or by those proponents of the bill; and we want to make—I, rather, want to make—a suggestion with reference to arranging so they can purchase homes. If it is a conservation proposition, of course I don't desire to be heard at this time, but if it is purely for the purpose of taking care of the soldiers—and if I understand it, it is in his name that this legislation is being promulgated—we desire to suggest what we think is a better remedy for the soldier.

It was admitted by, I think, all of the proponents of this measure that it will take from 18 months to 3 years in order to prepare the soldier's home in which he and his family might live. We want to suggest that you pass a bill here that will give him an opportunity to buy him a home at once and to buy it where he pleases. If you are going to give relief to the soldier, you ought not to undertake to tell him that he must move from the community from whence he enlisted in the Army, or was drafted into the Army, to some other domicile in order to get a home, if you really mean what you say. Of course, if you have got a conservation proposition, or you have got an irrigation proposition, or you have got stump land, cut-over land that you want to sell to the Government, or if you have got some arid, dry land that can't be used—like I have in my country—that you want to unload on the Government, that is a different proposition; but if you really mean what you say, that you desire to sell the soldier a home upon which he and his family can make a living, you ought to sell it to him at once and in the community where he desires to live; and I make this suggestion to the committee: That we loan, out of the Treasury, to the soldiers of the United States who served in the recent war who desire to purchase a farm, not exceeding \$5,000 for the purpose of purchasing himself a home in any portion of the United States that he desires. If it is adjoining his father's or mother's home, so much the better, if he can find that place. If it is improved land, so much the better; if it is unimproved land and if he desires to improve it, that is his business; but give him an opportunity to get himself a home and to get it where he wants it.

I undertake to say that—speaking as much, I believe, for the soldier as any gentleman of the committee or the proponents of this bill have a right to do, I will say that I can take any 200 or 200,000 soldiers and stand them before me and say: "We want to do something for you. You have saved the flag; you have saved liberty; you won this war and we want to arrange it so you can have a country home, a farm to live on. How do you want us to do it?" And the answer would be: "Well, let us have the money and go and buy it where we want it." I think that would appeal to more men than this proposition will. So, I refer again back to the proposition, that if it is your desire—if it is your real purpose to help the soldier, and not a conservation purpose, some scheme that somebody has fixed up to conserve arid lands or cut-over lands, or swamp lands—but if your real purpose is to help the soldier, let us do it and do it more economically and in a better, businesslike way than this is, where the soldier will get a greater worth for his money that he pays for and the Government will stand a less loss.

Now, my honest judgment about this bill is that we usually get about 60 to 70 per cent worth of our money, of the appropriations made by Congress. I don't believe that you will get 10 per cent out of this bill. I know you won't applying it in my own district, my own country. You have in the fifteenth district options, I think, on more land than all the rest of Texas put together. By this proposition you have—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). What do you mean by that? I do not quite get your meaning.

Mr. GARNER. They have gone down there and gotten a great many people—hunted them up and said: "We will take your land. What

will you take for it?" "Well, we will take \$20 an acre," or "\$10 an acre." They say, "All right," and make a memorandum of that and take it back, and they are now surveying in my district the greatest irrigation project in the world. And the department should be commended for spending that money. It is probably the best spent money out of the \$200,000. The people put up \$15,000 and the Interior Department put up \$15,000, \$30,000 for the survey. It is in the Rio Grande Valley, where they can irrigate by gravity more than a million acres of land, the richest land in the world, and it is all with this particular scheme in view.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is that project in your district?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is that to buy out the farmer or let him have part of his land?

Mr. GARNER. Now, Mr. Raker, you will have to work that out yourself. I think, as far as my territory is concerned, that the people down there, so far as I know, are overwhelmingly in favor of the proposition. The Texas Legislature passed a resolution, the senate and house almost unanimously favoring the Lane proposition. Of course they had never read the Lane proposition; they didn't know what it was, but they were getting Government funds spent in Texas to produce farms for somebody to live on, and they wanted that. That is the way the Texas Legislature looks at it. They sent a delegation here, the governor did, three State senators, and a representative of the Chamber of Commerce in order to tell the 18 members of the Texas delegation how they should vote on this proposed Lane bill at the last session. I have read this bill and there isn't a material difference between this proposition and theirs—some difference in detail.

Mr. SMITH. Have you estimated, Mr. Garner, how much it would take to furnish \$5,000 to every soldier that would like to have it to buy a farm?

Mr. GARNER. I have figured it out enough to know that it will cost less than the proposition that you have got now to furnish the same number of soldiers with homes. I am going to take care of as many soldiers as you do. Under your proposition, you propose to take care of a certain number of soldiers, and you take that number and multiply it by 5,000—I say not exceeding \$5,000—some may want \$2,000, some \$2,500, or \$3,000—but I will take care of more soldiers under my plan than you will under your bill and do it at less expense, and I will have land, gentlemen, that the soldier can take and utilize, he and his family, in the country that he wants to live in. For instance, there are a little over 8,000 troops from my district in this war. You say you are going to get 25 per cent of those troops. All right, that is 2,000. What are you going to do with them? You are going to take them two or three hundred miles out of my district and put them in some other district, and you are going to confine that particular territory to occupancy by those troops alone, not allow anybody else to live there.

Mr. SMITH. How many troops from Texas, 8,000?

Mr. GARNER. No; from my district. I was just illustrating my district. You are going to put it on one of these projects in Texas. You are going to put it in Sam Rayburn's district, or on the cut-over

lands in east Texas, or up in the prairie country. What are you going to do, take 2,000 soldiers out of my district and put them in one particular place where nobody else can live except a soldier? I don't believe it is feasible.

Mr. MAYS. You plan would not increase the total number of farmers or the number of homes?

Mr. GARNER. Yes, sir; I am just simply trying to eliminate the conservation feature. You can throw around this scheme all the safeguards you want to—I have some in mind myself. I would provide that in case he sold this land, at the option of the Government, the debt should become due and payable. I would also provide that in purchasing this land an agent of the Farm Loan Bank—or if you want to make a new independent bureau, I will do that, but I am somewhat opposed to creating additional bureaus; I think the Farm Loan Bank can do it, and go with him and see that he neither cheated the Government nor the individual cheated him. In other words, I would not permit a man to buy for \$5,000, a piece of land worth \$1,000, and to divide \$4,000 with somebody else and immediately abandon it. So, therefore, I would have a Government agent there to see that the land was reasonably worth the amount of money that he paid for it.

Mr. SMITH. Under your plan, there would not be any more land under cultivation than there is now.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, now you are coming back to just exactly what I stated. You are not going to help the soldier; you are going to force more land into cultivation. That is not my purpose at all. My purpose—what I am trying to get now is to draw your attention and to confine you to one thing: You want to help the soldier; you don't want to put any more land in cultivation. If you want to enact legislation for conservation, to force more land into cultivation, I will be glad to consider that question, but you say that you want to help the soldier. That is what you state. I want to help the soldier, and I challenge you to produce the method better than I suggest and that will appeal more to the soldiers in this country than the one I suggest.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Garner, how about the soldier that wants to go onto a new project where it is reclaimed by the Government or being irrigated by the Government?

Mr. GARNER. I say, "Go right along, Mr. Soldier. Go out there." Let him have \$2,000, or \$3,000, or \$4,000, or \$5,000, and buy a place there.

Mr. BARBOUR. But the Government has got to spend a lot of money putting it in shape and reclaiming it.

Mr. GARNER. You mean to say that there isn't enough land in cultivation in this country now to supply the needs for those men, a comfortable place to live in?

Mr. BARBOUR. He might prefer that kind of a place.

Mr. GARNER. There are lots of irrigation systems in the West now.

Mr. BARBOUR. But most of them are pretty well taken up.

Mr. GARNER. Pretty well taken up? My dear sir, if you will observe, for instance, the Roosevelt Dam proposition—you know something about that?

Mr. BARBOUR. A little; not much.

Mr. GARNER. How many more families could settle there?

Mr. BARBOUR. A good many.

Mr. GARNER. I should say so.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is only one proposition.

Mr. GARNER. Now, I think you will settle more there than you will have soldiers apply for irrigated projects.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, let me ask this question—I am asking this for information: Are you opposed to developing new farming lands in the country?

Mr. GARNER. Indeed, not. I want to encourage it all I can, but I don't want you to do a thing for the soldier that is impracticable and then tell him it is all done for his sake. You tell him: "Mr. Soldier, we are going to take advantage of the conditions of the country and the fact that we want to help you, in order to put through a scheme that we have had in our brains all these years." I say that is not the fair thing to the soldier, because the soldier is going to say to me: "I don't want to leave here, Garner. I wish you would try and arrange it to get me down here with my father and mother, where I have always lived. They don't want me to leave." He comes back to Uvalde, my home town, where he has got a wife and one child.

I go back down there and say: "Well, we appropriated \$500,000, Bill, for you to make a home for you and your wife and baby to go to." "Well, how did you do it, Mr. Garner?" "Well, we appropriated this \$500,000, and we have gone over here in East Texas, where there is a lot of cut-over land, and we are going to send you over there with your wife and child, and give you \$100 a month while you dig up the stumps and build the house and the dairy and the other things, and after you get it all built, we are going to sell it to you at what it cost us to produce it through your labor." He is going to turn to me and say, "Well, I won't have it. I don't want any business of that kind."

Mr. SMITH. He is being paid for his labor.

Mr. GARNER. Through the value of his labor.

Mr. SMITH. But he is being paid for it.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with you. I said \$100 a month. Then the Government is going to sell him that land at what it cost the Government, through the value of his labor, to produce it. Now let me tell you what would happen in my own country—I don't know what it would be in yours, but you take the 100,000 acres that they have got options on—I say "options," I haven't seen them, but anyhow, they got men to price land to them—and you can take a soldier down there at \$100 a month and let him grub that land and put a house on it and improvements, and when you get through, he can go over here 10 miles away, the same kind of land, the same improvements and everything, and he can buy it for 20 cents on the dollar of what he will pay for that that he has worked on and developed. Now do you think the soldier wants to buy that kind of land?

Mr. BARBOUR. They are doing it in other places, Mr. Garner.

Mr. GARNER. How do you mean?

Mr. BARBOUR. The settlement propositions. We had a gentleman before us yesterday, who was connected with the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, and he told us about the big tracts that they are developing up there, and he said he could put thousands—I

have forgotten the exact number of thousands—on there in a year if they had the land available. And, if I remember his testimony correctly, he advises strongly against the very proposition which you now make, which, he said, in his opinion, could not be worked out successfully. Now, I don't know. I am not enough of a land expert or colonization expert to know whether it would work successfully or not.

MR. GARNER. I am going to ask you if you were a soldier in this Army and you came back home, you are between 20 and 30 years of age, a single man or a married man—you have come back to your home—and you really want a farm to live on, wouldn't you rather that the Government would permit you to buy a farm where you wanted it rather than to say: "We are going to set you off in a place that will be exclusively for soldiers; nobody can live there but soldiers."

MR. BARBOUR. Now, we have not finally decided that, about whether anybody shall live there but soldiers or not. I don't know what I would do now if I was a soldier, 21 or 25 years of age, but I will say this, that I did pull out from my home and preferred to go to another State when I was 25 years of age—not onto a farm, however. Some of them want to get away from their homes.

MR. GARNER. The soldiers will still have the right, under my suggestion, to go from one State to another. We say to John: "Here, you come back to Kentucky." And he replies, "I don't care to remain in Kentucky. I have had a little of life—of seeing the world. I want to move to Texas." All right, come on down, we will loan you money to buy a home down there. He hasn't got a thing now. He is going to leave father and mother and the old place and is going away—going to Texas. All right come down and buy a farm. We will loan you \$5,000, at 5 per cent interest on 40 years' time. Go down into Texas and buy yourself a farm and get started. Can you think of a better scheme than that toward helping the soldier at the present time?

MR. SMITH. Then, you are in favor of supplementing this legislation with the plan of loaning to individual soldiers who prefer to buy in some settled community?

MR. GARNER. I will tell you what I prefer. I have been in public life ever since I was 21 years old; I don't know whether I have made a success of it or not; but, anyhow, I have been hanging on to the public tit, as they say in Texas, ever since I came of age, and I don't know whether I have made a success of it, but I have made it a rule all my life never to deceive anybody, and never to deceive myself, and I undertake to say that there is not a man living that takes that bill and works it out practically and can conclude that it is for the purpose of helping the soldier. The same amount of money with the opportunity to get himself a farm where he wants to, to locate where he wants to, will give him some relief.

Now, I will join you in this: I am willing to experiment with you. I believe that the waste places in this country ought to be reclaimed just as intensely as you do; but I think it ought to be done by experimental stages. I am not willing to go and involve this country in from \$2,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000, as the Secretary of the Interior says, on an experiment. I would rather experiment with their

scheme awhile. I would rather try the conservation, that you speak of, with \$100,000,000 first. That is a good big sum to experiment with. Take \$100,000,000 for the purpose of experimenting and let anybody go out there that wants to; then you will be able to try it out fairly and see whether that will do the work that you say it will with reference to reclaiming arid lands and cut-over lands and swamp lands. If it does, I will go with you to the fullest extent.

Mr. SMITH. There is no experiment with the arid lands of the West, Mr. Garner.

Mr. GARNER. I know they are not experimenting in my country. For instance, I live in a country where the land was selling when I came to Congress at \$1 an acre that you can't buy for \$300 an acre now. So I know as much about that property as any man can know from observation without having cultivated the soil myself. My district has the largest irrigation system of any district in the United States. You will be surprised when I tell you that my district produces more sugar than any other district in the United States. It did not produce a pound 10 years ago. And it is that way with nearly everything else. The fifteenth district, that I represent, raises more onions than any State in the Union. So I know something about it, but I don't want to deceive the soldier; that is all there is about it. I will join you in this conservation, reclamation and all that, but let us not deceive the soldier.

Mr. RAKER. It is safe to say, then, Mr. Garner, that not only your constituents but yourself in the last 20 years, have made a success by reason of your being in public life and treating the public fairly.

Mr. GARNER. Well, that is a joke on me. [Laughter.]

Mr. NICHOLS. I will agree with Mr. Garner that the title of this bill is misleading. I would like to ask you as to the cost of your proposition, following up Mr. Smith's suggestion. The Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Lane, made the statement that 16 per cent, about, of the soldiers had expressed the desire to take this proposition up as it is indicated in this bill. Now, then, under your suggestion, wouldn't the percentage of soldiers who would care to ask Uncle Sam for a \$5,000 loan to buy a home any place they pleased, in a town or in a city, wouldn't the percentage be greatly increased, of those soldiers who would like to take advantage of that?

Mr. GARNER. If you will admit that premise, then I will admit the conclusion too, that my scheme is the best and the most attractive. If you come here to help the soldier; you didn't come here to make conservations; you didn't come here to buy land; you come here to help the soldier. Don't get away from that proposition, so if you admit that my scheme will attract more soldiers for the purpose of buying farms than your method will, then my scheme is the best for the soldier.

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree with you, Mr. Garner, but it is going to cost a great deal more money.

Mr. GARNER. We are not considering cost here; we are considering the soldier. We are considering his welfare; we want to do something for him.

Now, the President has recommended this in two messages, the Democratic President. He recommended this in his annual message of December and again in this session. The majority party has ap-

peared at this table and they have all said: "In the name of the soldier, we ask this." Now, in the name of the soldier, I ask you to do something really for his interest and not for the purpose of some other scheme, be it political or conservation or otherwise.

Mr. MAYS. Why not just give him \$5,000 and let him do what he pleases with it?

Mr. GARNER. I don't think that is good public policy. I don't think the soldier asks for that.

Mr. MAYS. Wouldn't there be a larger percentage that would ask for that?

Mr. GARNER. There probably would. But if you want to fool the soldier don't you think that a larger number would ask for \$10,000?

Mr. MAYS. But if a larger number asks for that, then it shows that it is a better scheme.

Mr. GARNER. It is a better scheme if you are going to give him something; but you don't propose to give him something.

Mr. MAYS. But isn't, after all, the test of it that that induces them to help themselves?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and I believe that my inducement is the best method.

Mr. MAYS. Will you permit him to sell that farm after he bought it?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and mature the obligation to the Government.

Mr. MAYS. And take the money and do whatever he pleases with it?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; but the Government has still got the \$5,000 that he owes on it. The Government don't lose a cent.

If I owned 10,000,000 acres of land myself I would be willing to take the place of the Government and say to each soldier in the United States:

"Come along, boys; I will sell you this land to the extent of \$5,000, every one of you. Make your home where you want to. If you want to buy 10 acres at \$5,000, the highest land, all right; or if you want to buy 640 acres of the poorest land, all right; just so you don't purchase more than \$5,000 worth. I will sell you this land and give you 40 years' time at 5 per cent interest, but when you leave that land the debt becomes due." I don't lose a cent.

Mr. MAYS. Would you send this man that you bought out back to the city?

Mr. GARNER. I don't know about that, Mr. Mays. You know we are creatures of environment. When you buy a fellow out, who was born and raised in the country, he don't usually want to go to the city; but it is pretty hard to get the city boys out into the country.

Mr. VAILE. After each of our wars, after the war of 1812, I believe also after the Revolutionary War and after the Civil War, we had some form of soldier settlement projects. Those were really in essence, not only helping the soldiers, but the policies of conservation, and the country was developed largely on account of it. Now, is there any essential fallacy in the combination of the two ideas, conservation and helping the soldier?

Mr. GARNER. I say there is some reason for it. I agree with you there is, but what I suggest is this, that it is wholly impracticable. It is wholly impractical to say to a man living in Kentucky, that you are going to move him away over here 100 or 200 miles and let him

work at \$100 a month to produce a farm out of the worst land in Kentucky, swamp land and cut-over land that nobody else wants, or arid land in my section of the country. You are going to take up the worst lands in the country and you are going to use his high-priced labor to produce a farm there, and after you produce it you are going to sell it to that poor devil, at what it costs to produce it.

Mr. VAILE. He is not obliged to produce it.

Mr. GARNER. No, but if he don't, you have that much land left idle; and the remark of the gentleman a while ago showed really what the purpose of it was, that in Mr. Lane's mind there was the thought that if in the course of three years this land was not occupied by soldiers they would let somebody else in it.

Mr. TILLMAN. You have turned a lot of that land into onion land and sugar land, which is now very valuable.

Mr. GARNER. Yes, a great deal of it—very fine land.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you think there are many opportunities in your State where it would not require a \$5,000 loan in order to establish a man in a segregated proposition?

Mr. GARNER. Well, of course I think \$5,000 will buy a man a home.

Mr. MAYS. It wouldn't buy much \$300-an-acre land.

Mr. GARNER. No, but he don't need but 5 acres of \$300-an-acre land.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will concede that your plan is more liberal toward the soldiers than the plan outlined in the Mondell bill, but our advice here from experts on these matters has been practically all against the scheme which you propose. They say it would not be practical. I don't know whether it will or not. Have you made any investigation into these matters to find out? Have you any data that you could submit to the committee?

Mr. GARNER. No, except I put myself in the place of the soldier. That is the only way I know how to do. I don't know how to do any other way, but to put myself in the place of the soldier. I have got a boy who served in this war, 22 years of age; he is a poor boy. He has come back from the war and has got his \$60 and a uniform that he don't know what to do with. He comes to me and talks to me and his mother about what he can do. Suppose I would say to him, "Now, son, you know the Government has got a farm up here in this cut-over land in east Texas, full of stumps, sandy land, but it is good land if you once get it under cultivation. A man can make a living over there. Now you go over there and dig out the stumps, and they will give you \$100 a month over there while you dig those stumps, and help to build a dairy, and help to build all the other things that go to make that community a center there a success, and when you get through, son, then you can buy a farm there at what it costs to produce that farm." Now, he will say: "Well, I don't know about that. Mother wants me to stay here and I don't know about going over there."

Then I might say: "But I will tell you another scheme, son. You can go right over across here and you can buy this land, a hundred acres of land, at \$50 an acre that is already in cultivation and has got a little house on it and everything of that kind," and he will say: "Father, I think I will do that." Now, I just ask you, as a matter of fact, if you were a soldier, which one of these schemes would you take?

Mr. SMITH. Why not give him his choice of either plan?

Mr. GARNER. Well, Mr. Mays asked this question, why not give him the \$5,000 and all that? But you don't propose and I don't propose to give him anything. I am simply trying to arrange for him to own a farm, and that is all you are trying to do to-day. Is there anything in this bill except to give a soldier a chance to own a farm? That is all there is in my suggestion—give him a chance to own a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you an amendment embodying your ideas?

Mr. GARNER. I will have one, sir, as sure as you are living, if you get it before Congress. That is one thing certain. And I think I know parliamentary law enough to get it voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment along that same line? Would you favor legislation embodying your ideas of the purchase of a segregated unit?

Mr. GARNER. I don't know just what you mean. I would not favor legislation along experimental lines, along conservation lines, in this bill. I want to reclaim the lands in this country. I am intensely interested in it; but I tell you I don't believe it is fair to the soldiers. I just can't get it into my heart that it is treating the men fair to say, "On account of your patriotic service and the love of the country, for you we are going to classify you and give you a preference," and then offer them a thing like this.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you favor legislation permitting the soldier to buy a segregated tract in his own community?

Mr. GARNER. Indeed I would. If I was going into this experimentation scheme that you have here with, say, \$100,000,000, that you are going to turn over to Mr. Lane to experiment with, I would give it to Mr. Lane and tell him to "Go and experiment with it where you want to." I would take the three classes of land that you speak of, cut-over land, swamp land, and arid land. I would say: "Here is \$100,000,000, Mr. Secretary of the Interior; take this \$100,000,000 and go and experiment as you have outlined in your propaganda, and see if you can make it work. See if you can put that land into the form of community settlements and sell it for what it cost you. If you can, go to it; we will furnish you plenty more money to do the same thing."

The CHAIRMAN. We have already developed that—that we can do that successfully.

Mr. GARNER. Well, I will join you in that, and let anybody in the world settle on it that wants to; let the soldier go there or anybody else, but you don't have to provide that in a special bill for soldiers, but just provide enough money to open up all of these places, if you have settled the fact that you can do that, and then let everybody and anybody go in there that wants to. I think that is a good plan, because I will favor any legislation that will induce people to leave the cities and go to the country, but when you say you are going to do this in the name of the soldier, in order that you may benefit him, now—and last year it was urged right then because they were coming back—I don't believe it is the right way to do it.

Mr. MAYS. You would be satisfied to amend the title of this bill, wouldn't you?

Mr. GARNER. And make it a conservation bill; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Another thing, Mr. Garner, your State has passed some legislation on this matter, has it not? Are you familiar with that?

Mr. GARNER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They voted on May 24, did they not, for a measure of this kind?

Mr. GARNER. That was an amendment to the constitution not on this line. That was to lend the credit of the State in order to assist people who did not own farms to purchase them, but they will not be compelled to purchase them in a certain community.

Mr. VAILE. That was in order that woman's suffrage might be granted to the people of Texas, was it not?

Mr. GARNER. You see, we have a homestead law in Texas, and if you got a homestead worth \$25,000 or \$100,000, you can't borrow a cent on it. You are absolutely insolvent so far as the law of Texas is concerned if you haven't got additional property.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the legislation the people voted on down there on May 24, permitting the State to lend its credit for land-development purposes?

Mr. GARNER. That is the proposed amendment to the constitution of Texas in order that Texas might lend its credit for the purpose of assisting the people in buying farms. Now, that is just exactly on the line of what I am talking about, but you won't find Texas—now, mark my prediction—you won't find Texas appropriating millions of dollars and going down into my district, into the arid country, and saying, "We are going to take 100,000 acres and we are going to segregate it there and spend all this money developing it," while in the balance of the State you can not buy a farm anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a little wiser, Mr. Garner, in Texas than the other States have been. You did not surrender any public lands to the Federal Government.

Mr. GARNER. Well, the Federal Government did not surrender anything to us. We were an independent republic and we came in on equal terms.

Mr. RAKER. Let me ask you this question for practical demonstration: From your experience in this district, supposing now there are a thousand soldiers who have returned; some are married and some are not; they have no homes: but their parents live in and about that community. Supposing they were given \$5,000 apiece, are there places and lands enough there now that those boys could go and buy and establish their homes on from those that do own land, and go right on with additional improvements and improve the land more than it has been?

Mr. GARNER. Yes. Now, Mr. Raker, undoubtedly if you had this law that I suggest, and a boy comes down there, he would go and invest that \$5,000 under the advice of his father, of his friends. He would say, "Now, where is the best land? I believe I will go down here and buy some raw land. I will get more of it, and I will put this land in cultivation. I will have a stock farm and put part of it in cultivation and part of it I will raise stock on." That is the most prosperous business in our country. Neither one is so prosperous that excludes the other. And instead of that, you are going to arrange here for one particular class of farmers.

Mr. RAKER. What I wanted to know, right in addition, is there the quantity of land that you described where the boy can do that, now, even in the settled community where you live?

Mr. GARNER. Well, I don't know—you speak of 1,000—I doubt whether there would be. You would have to cover more territory than that. But, Mr. Raker, I do say that you will find that each community will be able to take care of its own people in the proposition of a soldier finding a home, and as I remarked a minute ago, a man from Kentucky or Tennessee that has been to France and has been over here in the east, the eastern part of the United States, has got a roaming disposition and he wants to see more of the world—very naturally. What does he say to his father and mother? “I would like to go down to Texas,” or “I would like to go down to Arizona,” or up into Mr. May's country, up into Utah. “All right, John, go ahead; God bless you; our blessings are upon you. Go out there, select a farm. You can borrow \$5,000 to help you start on that farm from Uncle Sam.”

Now, if you don't have that scheme, if you have your scheme, you say: “No, John, there isn't but one place in the world that you can go. That is a certain place out there where they are going to put in irrigation, cut-over land, and drain the swamps”—or the other.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Garner, this bill, of course, contemplates settlement, as nearly as possible, in each of the 48 States, which does not necessarily mean arid lands, swamp lands, or cut-over lands. It has been brought out repeatedly in these hearings, and it is contemplated, as I figure it out, taking Secretary Lane's estimate at about \$6,000, which would probably be the total amount primarily loaned to the soldier; this will take care of 83,000 soldiers. Now, if we were to divide that between 48 States, then we are only providing an opportunity for 1,700 soldiers in each State. This, as I understand, would not necessarily have to be all in one State or one locality, or anything of the kind. One hundred families, for instance, would make a very nice little unit, and the fact that this might be divided up into 10 or 15 or 17 different localities in the States, would that modify your views?

Mr. GARNER. Well, I got the impression that probably with the amount of money you got you would not hardly have over 48 projects in the United States. The money would hardly pay for more than 48 projects of the kind Mr. Lane has outlined in the statements I saw, because he proposed to cut out a certain block of land here and do certain things, and the amount of money you have got here would not provide for more than 48 projects.

Mr. SUMMERS. It has been brought out here that projects of 4,000 to 8,000 acres would be quite respectable projects.

Mr. GARNER. Well, gentlemen, I did not want to press my views on you. You wrote a letter to the various delegations, and, as I say, the Texas delegation took you too seriously, and supposing that you really wanted to know what our views were we got in there and hobbled around for about two hours, and I think I speak the sentiment of the delegation. They want to do something for the soldiers.

Mr. SMITH. Could not your plan be followed out under the provisions of this law if it is enacted? There is nothing in here to prohibit the plan you suggest.

Mr. GARNER. Well, probably not. I read your bill, but I don't think I see any provision in it for that.

Mr. RAKER. What would you think of this proposition? The record shows that there are about 1,500,000 acres of available land under established projects, projects uncompleted but that can be completed in all the way from 6 months to a year and a half. If we appropriated enough money to get enough of these soldiers right onto these projects now, these million and a half acres would be available at once.

Mr. GARNER. That would be all right so far as the employment scheme is concerned; yes. Another thing, Mr. Raker, I will go with you to the full length of this bill toward appropriating money to reclaim the desert lands of the West. I have always been in favor of that. I will go with you to the fullest length after you first demonstrate—I refer now to cut-over land. I want to get an experiment in that line. When I get an experiment in cut-over lands I am willing to go to the full length of reclaiming every acre in this country. The same with swamp land, but I don't want to go in and do this experimenting and then go and tell the soldiers: "Gentlemen, you have been patriotic and we want to do something for you." There is nothing in this bill for the soldier except to give him possible employment, so far as benefiting him by giving him a home and a homestead is concerned. I don't want to be harsh in my language, but I think it is an insult to him to talk to him about going to produce a farm like this and buying it from the Government for what it cost.

Mr. VAILE. It has occurred to me that the individual buying of land by the soldier was simply lending him money to buy land with, and that doing that, allowing him to buy wherever he wants to, is bound to bring in a large amount of real estate speculation. Could that be effected satisfactorily without the intervention of the real estate speculator?

Mr. GARNER. I will say to you that that is the principal objection that I have to the suggestion I made. I will be very frank with you, that is the principal objection that I see to it. But whatever you do, if you are going to really help the soldier—I mean if you are going to really help him, not pretend to help him and hold up a gauze here that he can see through—you are going to increase the circulating medium of this country. That is what you are going to do. There isn't any use of talking about going out and helping a great class of people without increasing or boosting up something. You can't do it.

Mr. BENHAM. That would be true, Mr. Garner, that at home he would in most cases have the chance of advising with his father and mother and friends, I believe, to as great degree as he would have on one of these projects.

Mr. GARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Suppose he lived in the city.

Mr. GARNER. I will answer, if he lives in the city, all right. My boy lives in Washington now and he has served in the war and wants to buy a home in Texas. Now, what do I do with him? I say to him: "All right, here is a letter. Go from here to Houston and see the farm loan bank and get hold of the agent and tell him to go and help you buy a good farm." The Government is indirectly loaning money on land now through the farm loan bank and loaning money to the

extent of 60 per cent of the value of the land, and this is just carrying that plan one step further and loaning them 100 per cent. It is the farm loan bank plan exactly with the modification that instead of loaning 60 per cent they loan them 100 per cent. That is what I tell my boy, if he lives in Washington, go down to Houston and see the farm loan agent and get him to take you out and help you to buy a good farm. We will have a Government agent for the purpose of advising that boy in getting a good farm, and he is not going to be cheated.

Mr. RAKER. The farm loan bank is doing one thing, Mr. Garner, that where men are trying to get loans on their lands the agents have gone in and appraised the property and have got it down to its real, actual value, and the people that are buying and investing are getting land for one-third to one-fifth of what they got it for a year ago by the farm loan agents really appraising the land at what it is worth.

Mr. GARNER. Now, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I will join with this committee and join with anybody in the conservation of the resources of the country. You have seen enough—Mr. Taylor has especially since I have been in Congress. He has been here long enough to know that I will join with the West in their reclamation service and join with the East or the Middle West in the cut-over land and swamp-land reclamation. I want to reclaim these things, but gentlemen, let us experiment with the two latter propositions—we have already experimented with the first—and let us not tell the soldier that we are going to do all this for him, because it will not help him; we are doing it for the whole people of the United States; and if we are going to help these soldiers, induce them to leave the city and produce more in the country on the farm, let us sell the soldier a farm where he wants it and where he will be socially congenial and have happy surroundings and not force him to go to some other place where he may not want to live.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the State of Texas, in your judgment, approve of extending the present reclamation law so that it will apply to cut-over land and swamp land, and then also add your provision to this bill, so as to make it possible that we might carry out both?

Mr. GARNER. I believe they would, Mr. Taylor. I have never talked to an audience in Texas, even in middle Texas, where I was born and raised. I have never talked to one of them that was not in favor of the Government activities in the direction of reclaiming arid lands. And I have heard them talk about swamp lands—I never heard so much about cut-over lands—never had a great deal of discussion over that, but the swamp lands and arid lands in our country, they are in favor of the Government activities there, and I am in favor of it, and I believe you will find the whole United States is in favor of it. But, gentlemen, when you come to say: "We are going to do this in the name of the soldier and for the benefit of the soldier," it is not so, and you ought not to try to fool the soldiers.

Mr. MAYS. Well, we loan him money at a low rate of interest and long-time payments.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and the land will cost him so much more at 4 per cent that he could go right out there and rent land right next to it at a better price.

Mr. SMITH. It is not the intention of the Interior Department to reclaim tracts of land that would not be worth what they cost.

Mr. GARNER. Down in our country when we reclaim this land we do it with Mexican labor by contract. I mean by contract that they grub an acre of land for \$6 to \$8. There isn't a soldier in the United States, I will say, that hasn't had any experience, that could grub one of those acres of land in a month to save his life, and the cost would be \$100 in place of \$6 or \$8. That is the point exactly. The same way with digging those ditches, and the same way with everything else. When you pay \$100 a month to the soldier and he is going to work eight hours a day, and that is what you are going to pay, and you are going to put the eight-hour clause in it. The cost of production is too great.

Mr. RAKER. Just carrying your thought one step further, supposing we amend the irrigation law just as it stands, letting it apply to all the States, including swamp and cut-over land, and then appropriate a sufficient amount of money to carry it out.

Mr. GARNER. I will help you.

Mr. RAKER. Then we will have the machinery to go right in.

Mr. GARNER. You do that in the name of conservation.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; in the name of making this country produce all it possibly can.

Mr. GARNER. I am in favor of it, but, Mr. Raker, don't do that in the name of trying to immediately help the soldiers.

Mr. MAYS. There would be no objection to giving a soldier preference, would there?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, no; certainly not. That will help him some. I believe in giving him all the preference possible, but, Mr. Mays, don't go and undertake to do something the purpose of which is something else, and say: "Now boys, this is all to help you." That is not true. We don't want to fool these soldiers, and you won't fool them long either. They will have enough live people among them to tell them "No don't be fooled; here is the practical effect of this."

Mr. MAYS. If they profit by it they wouldn't care whether they are fooled or not, would they?

Mr. GARNER. Well, I suppose not. But I think you will find some patriotic men, Mr. Mays, among the soldiers. I think you are going to find some of them that are going to put the welfare of this country above selfish interests.

Mr. RAKER. Just carrying this thought one step further, if you do that and give the soldier the preference right to get one of these homes where he can come in in six months or a year and put himself on the land, would it not really be giving the soldier some recognition?

Mr. GARNER. Yes; that would give him some recognition, certainly, and I will join in that, and I think you will find everyone else will join you in an effort to do that. But when you come along and say, "We are going to make this a fine thing for the soldier, and this is what we are going to do for the soldier," it is not going to work out, as well you know.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Garner. Gentlemen, it is now 12 o'clock and the committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, June 5, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, June 5, 1919.

The committee met at 10.15 a. m., Hon. Nichols J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. RAKER. Before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, I received yesterday—and I suppose all the other Members of the House did—five pages of typewritten matter relative to this bill from the Farmers' Alliance—the National Grange. It is sent out for circulation and evidently to pre prejudice the public mind with the idea that this committee is not fair and is not giving parties like this an opportunity to be heard, which, of course, is absolutely unfounded and contrary to the facts.

To the end that these people may have a hearing and that we may cross-examine them, I move you that the president and the secretary of this association—they say they are in Washington—be invited to appear before the committee and be requested to come in order that we may have an opportunity to hear them.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Judge, before you go into that, will you get the letter, Mr. Baldwin, that you wrote to Mr. Atkeson yesterday? Were you here yesterday, Judge, when we had up the matter of the change in Mr. Atkeson's testimony?

Mr. RAKER. I am always here, Mr. Chairman, but the last week I have been bothered with my ears, and I can hardly hear what goes on in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked to have certain editorials incorporated in the record, and the motion was made by Mr. Elston and the clerk of the committee sent to him this letter:

The Public Lands Committee, at a meeting this morning, discussed the matter of allowing you to insert the newspaper clippings attached to your testimony, when I returned the same to you for correction; also the matter of material change in the answer to a question asked of you at the time you made your statement.

The following motion was made and carried:

"That Mr. Atkeson be permitted to appear before the committee later and submit his special request that the newspaper articles be inserted, and to give such further testimony as he wishes in connection with the matter under consideration. In the meantime the testimony should remain as taken by the stenographer."

The chairman directs me to inform you of this and to invite you to appear before the committee, if you desire, for this purpose.

Mr. RAKER. What I wanted is to have the direct action of the committee, so that we may have this president and secretary, or some one else, appear before the committee in order that we may examine them. I want to find out who is paying this money for this propaganda; who is behind the theory of it, instead of allowing them to criticize the committee and saying that we did not give them a chance, which is not a fact. This man was given an opportunity to make a statement and every member of the committee was given an opportunity to examine him, and we might just as well investigate here as any other place. We have started out on the right foundation; and, if we give everybody a fair opportunity, we have got something then that they won't attempt to attack.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your motion?

Mr. RAKER. My motion is that they be directed to appear before the committee.

Mr. MAYS. Invited to appear.

Mr. RAKER. Well, invited.

Mr. TAYLOR. Suppose you have the clerk, Mr. Chairman, write to this man that the committee has officially taken this formal action, in addition to the action of the chairman the committee asks him to come here and speak up before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. They have a legislative committee and an executive committee in the city. We might invite their representatives to appear.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; that is the purpose of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done. That invitation is issued in view of these circulars that are being sent around.

Mr. RAKER. The purpose is, in addition to that, when the man is right here in the city—this committee has adjourned its hearings for a month at a time in order to give people a chance to come across the continent and be heard; and when we start out on an important matter like this, and men right here in Washington assume that a thing is so, when it is not a fact, I think it is our duty to bring them right up to the snubbing post.

The CHAIRMAN. The fact is that Mr. Atkeson stated he would need less than 15 minutes, and two or three times in the record it was stated that certain questions would not be taken out of his time. He stated twice that he was through, as far as he was concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to have your invitation go into the record, Mr. Chairman. Put it in there, so that it will go along with his statement.

Mr. SMITH. Has Mr. Atkeson had an opportunity of replying to this letter from the chairman or the clerk? If not, there is no occasion for the committee taking any further action now.

Mr. RAKER. The action of the committee, as indicated by my motion, was taken by reason of a nine-page press notice in which it is stated that this is a packed committee.

Mr. SMITH. Who is the letter from?

Mr. RAKER. I don't know.

Mr. SMITH. Who is it addressed to?

Mr. RAKER. It is not addressed to anybody, but it purports to come from the people represented by Mr. Atkeson.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think it is safe to assume that he wrote that letter.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Raker, did you say the communication is unsigned?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Then, why should this committee pay any attention to it whatever?

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't think this committee ought to notice an anonymous matter like that.

Mr. MAYS. Well, it is going to all the papers in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. There are charges in there that should not be ignored.

Mr. BARBOUR. Couldn't we have copies of it, Mr. Chairman? I have never seen this letter. Couldn't we get copies of it?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been sent generally to members of the House, I believe.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, we should wait a day or two to see whether Mr. Atkeson responds personally or by letter to the request of the committee to appear.

Mr. RAKER. No; I am in favor of nipping this thing right in the bud. They did the same thing two years ago on the oil business, and the record showed that they were spending two or three hundred thousand dollars for this propaganda, and when we brought the men before the committee they tried to get out of it and showed that there wasn't anything in the statement made, and we proceeded with proper legislation instead of having the money expended to try to besmirch the committee and the House and taking no action on it. I believe in hitting the thing right on the head and bringing them right up here now while this matter is under consideration.

Mr. BENHAM. Who will we reply to in the matter, if it is an anonymous letter? To whom will we direct our reply?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that [reading]: "Press notice. For Washington correspondents and press associations. For release upon receipt."

Now, it goes on to state that this organization will fight this matter and that their representatives did not have a hearing, and evidently it must come from them. If it did not come from them, then they can come before the committee and say it did not. Some faker has started this thing, and I want to know who he is. That is all. But the motion is carried.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have witnesses here that desire to be heard. Do you desire to be heard, Mr. Starr? Will you state your name and whom you represent?

STATEMENT OF MR. WESTERN STARR, OF BALTIMORE, MD., REPRESENTING THE FARMERS' NATIONAL SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

Mr. STARR. Mr. Chairman, my name is Western Starr, and I am a resident of Baltimore. I am a farmer. I represent the Farmers' National Single Tax League, and I am here on their behalf as well as on my own to oppose this bill on several grounds.

As a preliminary I would like to state that the activities of the departments of the Government and the great interest that has been shown by different Congressmen, as evidenced by the number of bills that have been introduced covering this broad question in part, and including in part other questions, indicate a state of the public mind that is entirely worthy of the most serious attention of this committee, and I believe it has in hand at this time one of the most important questions, one of the most important general subjects that can come before the Congress at any time.

Mr. Kent indicated it probably as well in his remarks yesterday when he said the bill should properly be described as a bill to distribute or redistribute population. Now, the very title of the bill, in my mind, condemns it. It purports to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served in the military and naval forces, through the reclamation of lands, etc. Now, just let us take a minute on that. Assume that there were 4,000,000 men in the

uniformed service of the United States during the late unpleasantness. If we estimate the number of those who came from farms in proportion to those who came from cities by the absolute fact of the relative proportions of the population, about one-third of them came from farms and the balance came from the cities. In addition to the 4,000,000 in the uniformed service, there were about 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 in the ununiformed service this side of the water whose services were equally important with those in uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. If it will not interrupt you, could you give the figures how you arrive at that one-third?

Mr. STARR. Because the population of this country lives one-third in the country and two-thirds in the city. About 33 to 35 per cent of the population of the Republic lives in the rural districts, farmers that live upon farms. Fifty years ago 70 per cent were living in the country. Now there is only about 30 to 35 per cent that are living in the country, and if the conscription measures were proportionately and fairly administered, as I have a right to assume they were and as the record seems to show, two-thirds of the soldiers that were put across and put into uniforms came from the cities, the urban districts, and only one-third came from the country.

Now, in addition to that, it took four—the least estimate that I have ever seen was that it took four men out of uniform to support one man in uniform. There are those that claim that it takes five men in civilian clothes to support one man in uniform. Now, the men who were not in uniform, but who were just as seriously engaged in this war, and who made every sacrifice, except the peril of death and maiming, wounding, permanent crippling, are just as much entitled to consideration in any bill which this committee has to consider for the distributing of public lands and providing homes and employment as the men who are in uniform.

Mr. FERRIS. Don't you make any distinction between the man who goes out and makes the last offering for his country, who offers his life, and the man who stays at home and enjoys the comforts of peace?

Mr. STARR. Certainly I do. I make a big distinction. I make a great distinction.

Mr. FERRIS. Your statement would imply that you did not.

Mr. STARR. No, sir; I will not allow you to assume that, if you please. I remember what I said.

Mr. FERRIS. The record will remember better than you or I either can.

Mr. STARR. I don't wish to antagonize the gentleman at all—

Mr. FERRIS (interposing). Now just wait a minute. You are a witness before this committee. You just hold on.

Mr. STARR. I will answer any question.

Mr. FERRIS. You are here at the pleasure of the committee. Just wait a minute. Read that statement back there that the gentleman made.

The reporter read the record, as follows:

Now, the men who were not in uniform but who were just as seriously engaged in this war, and who made every sacrifice, except the peril of death and maiming, wounding, permanent crippling, are just as much entitled to consideration in any bill which this committee has to consider for the distributing of public lands and providing homes and employment as the men who are in uniform.

Mr. STARR. I think that is what I said.

Mr. FERRIS. Then that is the statement of fact that you want the committee to have?

Mr. STARR. I am willing the committee should have it in just that way.

Mr. FERRIS. You don't desire to change it, and that is your view?

Mr. STARR. I have not finished my remarks yet, and I propose to extend them to cover that point, if you will allow me to continue long enough to do so.

I am making the criticism here that the bill is confined strictly to uniformed service—the men who served in uniform. Now, I am making this point, that if you propose to have a bill that is practical, a workable bill, and which will produce the results that the committee desires to have accomplished, you have got to extend it and make no distinction in allowing men, whether they were in uniform or not in uniform, to take advantage of the bounty of the Government in providing homes for themselves. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where do you make the limit, or do you make any limit at all?

Mr. STARR. No limit at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Make it apply to everybody in the United States?

Mr. STARR. Everybody in the United States who wants to take advantage of the provision of Congress to get a home and add to the productive power of the country should have the same right that every other man has.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me understand you. Then in what way would you favor the soldier over the man who was not a soldier?

Mr. STARR. When I reach that point I will tell you.

Mr. FERRIS. But you have reached it twice—three times. You have stated that you would put this bill and all other bills—that you would have it apply to nonsoldiers the same as to soldiers.

Mr. STARR. I think if the gentleman will permit me—I haven't gotten ten words beyond the point that you are raising. I will anticipate my remarks.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, go ahead.

Mr. STARR. I will anticipate what I intended to say in the order in which I intended to say it, and now I would give the uniformed men a preference over anybody else as to a particular site or location. The time is not so long ago—less than 30 years ago—when Oklahoma belonged to the United States Government, and when the time was announced that they were going to open it up, they camped on the borders of Oklahoma for weeks, to make a rush to the place that they had picked out. Now there would be no possibility of that in the proposition that I wish to make. Let every man—

Mr. FERRIS (interposing). That was not a soldier proposition at all.

Mr. STARR. That was not a soldier proposition, but you are going to make a uniform thing to everybody, and it will be practically the same thing here unless you make a distinction.

Mr. FERRIS. There is no disposition to make this uniform. This applies to the man who served his country alone.

Mr. STARR. You are providing for the uniformed soldier solely; I maintain, and I think I can show, that unless you make it apply

to everybody, with such distinctions in favor of the uniformed man as gives them a preference, your bill will amount to nothing in results. That is what I am trying to tell you.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. Mr. Starr, do you not think it would be well to let the soldiers have the preference for two or three years, and then bring in the civilians if the soldiers do not want the land?

Mr. STARR. If you care to do that; yes.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. I think that would meet your position, would it not?

Mr. STARR. What I am trying to get at is here—you will pardon me, and I hope the committee will not misunderstand me when I make this statement—it has already been stated by men who are close students of affairs and of social philosophy and of political activity, that this bill, is not intended as a genuine bill to help anybody except a few politicians who wish to capitalize the soldier vote.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment, now, gentlemen—

Mr. WHITE (interposing). Is that your statement?

Mr. STARR. That is not my opinion.

Mr. RAKER. Now, will you state in the record who those people are?

Mr. STARR. I can't give you the names.

Mr. RAKER. Now, you have made a very broad statement. Can you give the names of any of them—of anybody?

Mr. STARR. Why, I don't know that I can. I have heard it discussed in conversations.

Mr. RAKER. Who have you heard discuss it along the line that you suggest now?

Mr. STARR. I have heard different people discuss it.

Mr. RAKER. Name a few of them.

Mr. STARR. I am not going to name any of them.

Mr. RAKER. You can't name a single one?

Mr. STARR. I don't want to name them. I am not going to name them.

Mr. RAKER. Why not?

Mr. STARR. Simply because I haven't their consent to name them.

Mr. RAKER. You can't withhold—just a moment now—I am going to have something to say on this committee myself. A man comes here and makes a charge of this kind, and we are entitled to get the names of the men that make the statements, and I demand of you now that you give their names.

Mr. STARR. Well, I want to make this statement now. I have not stated this as my opinion at all; I have expressly said that it was not my opinion.

Mr. RAKER. I don't care whether you stated it as your opinion or not; you stated that certain men are making this kind of statements. Now, kindly—to the end that we may find out the truth about this matter—give the names of some of these people.

Mr. STARR. I can't do it; I won't do it.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Starr, were any of them soldiers?

Mr. STARR. No; none of them were soldiers.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is your interest in the bill political or economical?

Mr. STARR. Purely economic. I have no party and I belong to no party.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Your aspersion would apply, then, to the members of this committee, who are supposed to be in politics?

Mr. STARR. No; it does not apply to the members of this committee. You are a Congressman, of course, and I stated that I would not be misunderstood in making the suggestion. What I say is that the bill is unworkable and impractical in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, do you include the President of the United States in your insinuation upon politicians?

Mr. STARR. Certainly not. I didn't know the President of the United States had anything to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you include Theodore Roosevelt, now deceased, in your aspersions upon the politicians who were back of this idea for political purposes?

Mr. STARR. Well, I don't know that it will be possible to say that any public character or politician, a man who holds a public office as the result of popular choice, election, considers anything except from a political point of view, or that that point of view is included in the general sum of the basis of his actions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that point of view is a sinister point of view, and solely for mercenary and selfish purposes?

Mr. STARR. Not at all. That a thing is political does not make it sinister or mercenary.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean political, then, in the favorable sense and not in the unfavorable sense?

Mr. STARR. I am using the term as a definition, as an attempt to determine what is public policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you mean political in the favorable sense, not the unfavorable sense?

Mr. STARR. Not the sinister or unfavorable sense at all. I understand politics to be in its essence nothing more or less than an effort to determine what public opinion is and the giving of effect to it. That is my understanding of the word "politics." A successful politician anticipates public opinion and expresses it.

Mr. FERRIS. I am afraid that the gentleman's statement was so broad that it took in a good deal more than that. Will you just read what he said regarding the political side of this matter?

The reporter read the record, as follows:

* * * It has already been stated by men who are close students of affairs and of social philosophy and of political activity that this bill is not intended as a genuine bill to help anybody except a few politicians who wish to capitalize the soldier vote.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you think that Secretary Franklin K. Lane, who originated this plan, did it for no good purpose for the soldier, but simply to capitalize the soldier vote?

Mr. STARR. Certainly not. No one in the world would ever say that.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you think President Wilson, when he issued his message at the opening of this Congress, advocating this legislation in the strongest terms—do you think he was doing that simply to get the soldier vote?

Mr. STARR. I have said all the way through that was not my opinion. I don't think anything of the kind.

Mr. FERRIS. But the gentleman states in this record here, in terms loud and clear, that men who are students of government, students of

philosophy, have stated that those who were behind this bill were trying to capitalize the soldier vote.

Mr. STARR. I have heard those statements made.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, in response to the question by Judge Raker, who asked you the name of one man who had said that, to name one person to whom you referred, you said you would not state his name, and you refused to.

Mr. STARR. I have so stated.

Mr. FERRIS. Now you are satisfied to make a record like that before this committee?

Mr. STARR. I am willing to let it go just as I have stated it.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, is that the truth?

Mr. STARR. It is the truth that I have heard those discussions.

Mr. FERRIS. And it is the truth that you refuse to name a single one who ever stated that?

Mr. STARR. It is.

Mr. FERRIS. And it is the truth that you think that the men who really got up this bill—you now state that you think they have no such purpose as that?

Mr. STARR. If I can make myself understood—there is an unexpressed imputation in your question that I will not admit. I will say to you that I have heard those statements made in general discussion by groups of men who have considered all of these questions.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you or do you not adopt their statement?

Mr. STARR. I have expressly repudiated that; but that is not my opinion.

Mr. FERRIS. It is not your opinion?

Mr. STARR. No. I have repudiated that idea. I did it before I said anything about it.

Mr. FERRIS. Then why cumber this record with statements of men whose names you refuse to give and whose theories you refuse to stand for?

Mr. STARR. Simply because I wish to emphasize the fact that the very title of the bill its provisions shows to a thinking man that it is unworkable.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, that is a matter you are arguing there, of course.

Mr. STARR. It is unworkable for various reasons.

Mr. RAKER. May I ask you one question? Then I will not trouble you any further. Do you remember these men who made this statement, these philosophers?

Mr. STARR. I have some of them in mind.

Mr. RAKER. Let me finish my question—who advocated the theory that you put in the record there as to the purpose of this legislation and the intent of those advocating it, and you come before the committee to assist the committee in getting proper legislation, and while remembering their names now, knowing them, you refuse to give their names to the committee? Is that correct?

Mr. STARR. Before I would undertake to give any of those names to the committee I would have to see those men themselves and get their permission to do it. They are men occupying fairly good positions in the world. They occupy responsible positions, some of them, and I am not going to put their names in here to be the target of this committee without their consent.

Mr. MAYS. What was your exact purpose in quoting this opinion?

Mr. STARR. In quoting the opinion? The object of my making the statement was to show that there is a fear that the bill is unworkable; that the very title of it and its provisions, as I stated a moment ago, on close analogy in comparison with the history of past legislation in connection with the same general subject, shows that the bill is unworkable.

Mr. MAYS. You agree, then with that theory that it is unworkable?

Mr. STARR. I agree that it is unworkable, and I am here to say so.

Mr. MAYS. Do you agree with these opinions you have just expressed?

Mr. STARR. I am not here to agree, and I do not agree with the opinion that it is intended as a political camouflage; I do not believe that for a minute.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Starr, all those men that you refer to, do you know whether they will appear before the committee or not?

Mr. STARR. I don't know. That contingency has never developed. I don't know what their view would be about coming before the committee and making their statement.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you think those gentlemen to whom you make reference, were posted on the subject?

Mr. STARR. By the process of elimination carried far enough, that question would, perhaps, identify some of the men. I will say that some of them are men who have been personally engaged in considering and examining this very subject for two years. There have been a number of bills introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your opinion that the plan should be more extensive and take in everyone?

Mr. STARR. My opinion is that the plan should be more comprehensive and take in everyone. At the close of the Civil War, at the close of the Mexican War, the Government issued land warrants to its soldiers. And in 1862, I think it was, Galusha A. Grow offered the homestead and preemption bill. After every war, even in the times of the Cæsars, there were attempts made to gratify the soldiers who had served the country in the field by giving them grants of public land, which was the available, accessible, ready means of rewarding the men who had undertaken the services to protect the country and to extend its power. That was true when we had those enormous areas of land that are now all gone. That was true after the Mexican War. I don't know what you would have to pay for a piece of Valentine Scrip now. I don't believe you could find one, except perhaps in a museum.

The CHAIRMAN. That was an absolute gift to the soldiers?

Mr. STARR. That was absolute gift to the soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. A voluntary gift on the part of the Government without any requirements on the part of the soldier other than the past service?

Mr. STARR. Certainly. And the natural result of that was that I doubt that if to-day 10 per cent of the families of the men who received Government warrants for land as soldier claims still have any interest in the land that the soldier took. I lived on the frontier myself for a number of years, and I knew cases, many of them,

where men who had been soldiers, who had taken homesteads and taken preemptions and sold them the minute they got their title—disposed of them for what they could get. They made land speculators of those men, rather than settlers—farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to the time prior to the passage of the homestead act?

Mr. STARR. I am referring to the time prior to the passage of the homestead act, and then subsequent to the homestead act. Of course there were a great many, absolutely a great many of those men that settled in good faith on that land, but relatively there were a very small number of them.

The CHAIRMAN. You want to keep the line of demarcation between what was done prior to the passage of the homestead act and afterwards. Before the passage of the homestead act there was a voluntary gift made to these soldiers.

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir; soldier scrip.

The CHAIRMAN. Without any requirements on the part of the Government?

Mr. STARR. Absolutely. But the same general principle, development of the speculative instinct, followed in all that granting that was made.

Now, the second point that I want to cover is this: That in order to—well, before I go on with that, in my own experience as a farmer, I have had some light thrown on the probabilities of taking advantage of this measure by soldiers in my own county. Between 1914 and 1917, in July, they took over 2,000 men out of my county and put them into the war machine in one way or another. Many of them went in uniform, but boys that could not earn 75 cents a day stripping corn or bugging potatoes, or hoeing weeds went up to Bridgeport and Newcastle and other places and got \$5 and \$6 a day for eight hours' work. Now, they have not come back yet. They went up there and lived in the atmosphere of the moving pictures and the bright lights and the joy rides, and they haven't gone back to the farm yet, and they are not going back. Now, most of the men who went from the city to the Army, young men with city training and development, are not going to the farm; and I want to say to you that more than half of the men who went from the farm into the Army, unless they were married men and had families living in the country, are not going back to the farm, and when they do go, they are not going out into the wilderness to take cut-over lands and develop them for the purpose of making a farm.

I know something about the cut-over land business. I have friends in northern Minnesota who went up there into the cut-over land district. You can't clear up this cut-over land—speaking about the land in Tennessee and Kentucky—you can't clear that land for an average of \$50 an acre and make it fit for the plow. It is impossible.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much an acre did you say?

Mr. STARR. \$50 an acre.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know that to be a fact?

Mr. STARR. Well, it has not been done yet.

Mr. JOHNSON. It has been done. Thousands of acres down in my country have been put into cultivation for a whole lot less than that.

Mr. STARR. Within the last few years?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir. And people from the Northern States, Wisconsin, Indiana, and West Virginia, have done it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you know that Capt. Connelly, one of the explosive experts in the Army, has offered to take a contract of a million acres of cut-over lands and clear it for \$10 an acre?

Mr. STARR. Well, you had better take it right away, because it cost me \$25 to \$30 an acre to clear up land on the Eastern Shore of Maryland before the war begun.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are using modern methods now, using T. N. T. to blow up the stumps.

Mr. STARR. I understand that in large production, large units, with a scientific, trained corps of men, you can go at a field or a problem of that kind and do it in a very different way from what the man does who hasn't even a team to work with, not even capital to buy a rope that he can pull on.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Government is going to do that. The Government is not going to turn these fellows out with a hoe and a shovel and a pick to clear this land with.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Starr, we had a representative of the State of Tennessee here testifying about the price of clearing land and also a representative from the State of Michigan on the clearing of land, and that is in the record—what did you say it cost you to clear your land?

Mr. STARR. It cost me \$25 to \$30 an acre to clear lands on the eastern shore of Maryland in 1913.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of timber?

Mr. STARR. Pine timber that had been cut over, and the second growth come on.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the stumpage of that land? What did it run to the acre?

Mr. STARR. What do you want?

The CHAIRMAN. I mean in thousand feet.

Mr. STARR. Oh, it was fit for fence posts and firewood only.

The CHAIRMAN. How many thousand feet to the acre?

Mr. STARR. We never measured it in feet. We measured it in cords. There wasn't any saw stuff in it.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many cords to the acre?

Mr. STARR. We could get all the way from 150 to 200 cords of wood.

The CHAIRMAN. How many feet are there in a cord of wood?

Mr. STARR. 128 cubic feet, if I remember my arithmetic correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. About 150 cords to the acre?

Mr. MAYS. Did it cost you \$25 in addition to what you got for the wood?

Mr. STARR. Yes, the wood was only worth \$1.25 a cord. I expect we could get \$8 a cord for it now.

Mr. MAYS. Well, if you were clearing it now, you would come out all right, wouldn't you?

Mr. STARR. Well, I don't know. There won't anybody clear it for the wood. They never used to.

Now, there is another feature here that I think is very important, and that is the possibility of alienation. If you allow this land to be alienated by the grantees, the title to the land, as distinguished

from improvements which the grantee may make, you are not going to get a great deal of improvement, and these men are not going to stay. If you will make it so that the land can not be alienated at all—I know what your provision in the bill is; you have a 10-year provision, and then you have got to have the consent of the Secretary and all that, but those are matters like the usury laws. You have got all the laws against usury that you want, but you have never been able to stop usury, and you can make all the laws you want to against alienation, and you will never be able to stop alienation in one way or another. Now, my proposition is that by making it unalienable, you will secure a class of population that is genuinely and honestly looking for homes in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. Won't you just make your suggestion right there?

Mr. STARR. My suggestion is that it shall be inalienable in any event; that the improvements can be transferred; that on the man's death, for example, or if he sees a better opportunity in some other part of the world and finds somebody that is willing to buy his improvements, that he shall have the right to sell his improvements; that the only title to the land itself must be use and occupancy. That is my opinion, and in that way you will get permanent settlement. You will get men really looking for a home.

The CHAIRMAN. You approve of this restriction as far as it goes, but you don't think it goes far enough?

Mr. STARR. As far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, Mr. Starr, if that be true, then the title would always remain in the Government, and it would be nontaxable.

Mr. STARR. No; it would not be nontaxable.

Mr. JOHNSON. You know you can't tax a homestead unless title passes.

Mr. STARR. Yes; I understand; but you are making a law here, and I think that it is a splendid opportunity to make a magnificent, grand precedent, and that is, that the user of that land shall pay to the Government, in lieu of taxes, the rental value of the land unimproved. Then you will have the whole question solved.

Now, to go further, a gentleman a few weeks ago at a conference here in the city made a demand for immediate consideration by the body of a proposition to demand of Congress an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for development purposes in a western State, a western region in which he said now the land was occupied by owls, jack rabbits, and rattlesnakes, but with \$100,000,000 they could provide homes for a certain number of soldiers. Now, I have a very different theory. The German Empire, with 70,000,000 people, occupied a territory of less than three-quarters the size of the State of Texas. There is land enough east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio to support all of the present population of the United States and as much more; and here, instead of appropriating millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to go out on land that a thousand acres of it won't support a jack rabbit, you would simply apply a revenue proposition to the land that is already held out of use in this country by private ownership, instead of spending that enormous amount of money continuously for what you get out of it, you will have built up your country and you will get \$2,000,000,000 of annual revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there enough idle land in the sections you refer to to put in operation your plan?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir; most undoubtedly there is. There is idle land in Massachusetts; there is idle land in Rhode Island—I have been offered lands within 15 miles of the city of Providence, R. I., for \$7 an acre. That was several years ago. I don't know what the price is now.

Mr. BAER. There is land in New Jersey that I wouldn't trade for land out in Arizona, at all.

Mr. STARR. That is true, undoubtedly. Then there is one thing about it, our soil survey system has developed a wonderful knowledge with reference to the character of our land. There are more different varieties of soil, take it in the State of Maryland alone, there are more different varieties of soil in the State of Maryland than there are almost in the whole continent of Europe, lying right close together. Now, some of that land is very valuable, and some of it is not worth fencing. And as Mr. Baer says, I know of land in Arizona, I know of land in Idaho—I have ridden over thousands of acres of it—that would not support a jack rabbit. Nothing but sagebrush on it, but with water on it it makes wonderful land. But why go out there and spend that money and anticipate developments when you are going right by the finest land that ever existed?

The CHAIRMAN. What were the States you have in mind in the East here?

Mr. STARR. There is land in Ohio; there is land in Pennsylvania; there is land in Indiana; there is land in any of these States that is unused.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is your suggestion? What amendments would you offer to this bill?

Mr. STARR. I would strike out the title of the bill and say, "To provide employment and rural homes for those who desire to take advantage of the opportunity."

Mr. JOHNSON. And let it apply to anyone?

Mr. STARR. Make it apply to anybody. Then I would put it over here—I would say, "This land shall be inalienable on the conditions indicated of a site value payment by the tenants to the Government in lieu of taxes."

Mr. JOHNSON. That is all I want to know.

Mr. MAYS. With those amendments, would you be for the bill?

Mr. STARR. I would be for that principle in any kind of a bill.

Mr. MAYS. But for this particular bill? Would you be for this particular bill?

Mr. STARR. For this particular bill? If you will amend it with those two propositions, I will be glad to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I ask this question? Do you own your land? You have fee-simple title to your land?

Mr. STARR. I have fee-simple title to my land. I sold it only a few months ago.

Mr. JOHNSON. Don't you think the soldier ought to have at some time a fee-simple title to his land for his children?

Mr. STARR. All that a fee-simple title gives to a man is permanent right of possession. That is all, and as long as the Government guarantees to him permanent right of possession he doesn't need

a fee-simple title. All the addition he gets with a fee-simple title is the capacity to be a speculator. And let me say this right on this line, the money that has been made or created by agriculture in the last 50 years has not been made as a result of cultivating the soil; it has been made by land speculators and not by farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much did you make out of your place when you sold it?

Mr. STARR. I bought it at X and sold it for XX.

Mr. JOHNSON. You object to speculation?

Mr. STARR. I object to speculation.

Mr. JOHNSON. You made 100 per cent?

Mr. STARR. I made 100 per cent; and as long as you allow that law to exist—as long as you make it necessary for me to have teeth and claws, I am going to use teeth and claws. I object to teeth and claws on my own part or anybody else's part.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have stated two reasons why the law was unworkable. First, the alienation feature and then the feature of making it apply only to soldiers.

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir. With those things removed, I will support the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS. Knowing that everything must have a beginning, would you have any objections to setting a good example regarding the tooth-and-claw proposition?

Mr. STARR. I am willing to go in with any community and do it.

Mr. MAYS. And take out your teeth?

Mr. STARR. Take away that kind of tooth. But you can't take it away from one without you take it away from all.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Starr, don't you recognize the necessity for and the great stimulus and the great aid to citizenship that the right to own one's own home gives? Don't you recognize that living principle in the country?

Mr. STARR. I recognize this, that the basis of all government and all that government exists for is to act as a big policeman to keep some man off from my back and to keep me off of his back in case I have predatory instincts. That is all government is for. Now, then, when government gives to me all that I can ask for—the peaceable, permanent possession of my opportunity to work out my own destiny—I am satisfied. That is all that anybody can get.

Mr. FERRIS. Then you would have the Government retain title to all the land?

Mr. STARR. I would.

Mr. FERRIS. If you sat here as chairman or an individual member of this committee and any bill came up allowing an acre of land to pass from the Federal Government—to pass title to the individual—you would oppose it?

Mr. STARR. Why, I would not want to say that. "Any bill" is a very broad proposition.

Mr. FERRIS. But you have said that, practically. You say that the trouble with this bill is, No. 1, that you oppose it because it permits alienation. In other words, you want the title held in the Federal Government and make a tenant of the soldier. Isn't that it?

Mr. STARR. I oppose the bill on one ground, that it allows alienation and offers an opportunity for land speculation—

Mr. FERRIS (interposing). Let me get down to that question again, without getting off of it. This is very important. The Government has some 300,000,000 acres of land in the United States and something over 300,000,000 acres in Alaska still the property of the Government, and we have about 70,000,000 acres of coal land, and about 370,000,000 acres of forest reserve, and 3,000,000 acres of phosphate land—something like that. Now, you wouldn't, under your theory, permit any of that to go into private ownership and stimulate private development?

Mr. STARR. Now, you are hitting a very broad question there, but I will say negatively no. The principle is wrong.

Mr. FERRIS. You think the principle of letting it pass from the Government is wrong?

Mr. STARR. The principle of allowing natural opportunity to pass out of the control of the social body into the hands of 'privateers' is wrong, fundamentally.

Mr. FERRIS. And you would make that true as to homesteads?

Mr. STARR. I make that true regardless. Now the fact of the matter is here, gentlemen, there are only two things that can be monopolized on the surface of this earth—just two, and one of them is natural opportunity and the other is the key to natural opportunity, and we call it credit. The landless man, the disinherited man, who seeks standing ground for the exercise of his abilities and capacities, to-day in order to get it has got to go and make terms with the monopolist.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, the second reason for your vigorous opposition to this bill here that you portrayed in the last few minutes is that it does not include everybody?

Mr. STARR. It does not include everybody. That is my first contention.

Mr. FERRIS. So those two objections are your main objections to the bill?

Mr. STARR. Those are my main objections.

Mr. FERRIS. So if we fix it so that the land would not pass from the Government and allow the leases to be sold; and second, that you would make it apply to everybody, every man who did not serve, as well as he that did serve, then you would be in favor of them?

Mr. STARR. Giving preference to soldiers, where conflicting claims arise, or if you want to make it two or three years, give them that preference. But I maintain that the man who is supporting a family in this country now or during the war, under the pressure of conditions as they were then, made sacrifices that should be recognized, if anybody is going to be recognized.

Mr. FERRIS. The general homestead law holds out to him the right to come and take any of this land any day he wants to.

Mr. STARR. He can't take land held in private control, and the land you offer him under the homestead law to-day he can't use. You might as well say that there are magnificent ore deposits on the moon. Everybody can go and establish a mine there. It can't be done. It is as impossible to do the one as it is to do the other.

Mr. HERSMAN. Will you point out the men that stayed at home and made the sacrifices that the soldiers did? Will you find out the class of men that stayed at home and made the same kind of sacrifices that the soldiers did?

Mr. STARR. No one made the same sacrifices.

Mr. HERSMAN. Will you point out the man that stayed at home and made sacrifices?

Mr. STARR. They did sacrifice.

Mr. HERSMAN. What class of men made sacrifices?

Mr. STARR. Well, the ironworkers, for example, as a type.

Mr. HERSMAN. When they got \$8 or \$10 or \$12 a day where they were getting \$4 before.

Mr. STARR. Some of them didn't get \$8 or \$10 or \$12 a day; but even if they did get \$8 or \$10 or \$12 a day, they had to pay double for everything they got in proportion. I don't like to hear the suggestion made that because these men had such wages that they haven't made serious sacrifices. A man's wages are not what he gets in his pocket, but it is what he has left after he has paid the bills.

Mr. HERSMAN. You think that if I stayed at home and bought the best investment on earth—Government Liberty bonds—that I made any sacrifice? Do you think that the man who stayed at home and bought Liberty bonds made any sacrifices?

Mr. STARR. I know some of the school-teachers in the town where I live made sacrifices when they bought Liberty bonds.

Mr. HERSMAN. It was the best investment they ever made. It taught them thrift.

Mr. STARR. They didn't make their investments; they were made for them by their bosses.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made any estimate of how much it would cost to consummate your plan?

Mr. STARR. Why, I made a rough estimate yesterday when the gentleman from Texas was talking about his plan. His plan involved a possible direct outlay of \$20,000,000. He made me think of a previous gentleman from Texas who, some years ago, asked: "What are we here for?" However, that is past.

The plan which I suggest here, so far as Government expenditure is concerned, would not involve any more money than the plan that you have in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. To consummate it?

Mr. STARR. To consummate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how do you arrive at that?

Mr. STARR. Because the changes in the bill—the changes which I suggest would do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you secure all this land which you have referred to at that price?

Mr. STARR. Yes; and more, too. You have in this bill a provision for acquiring land. Now, the proposed changes which I offer will make no change whatsoever in the expense to be attached to the acquisition of land or to its administration. You are providing a certain possible expenditure by this bill; my bill does not affect that at all, or my proposition does not affect that at all, one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you pay an acre for the land that you propose to secure?

Mr. STARR. Why, I would pay what it is worth in the market. I would pay what it is actually worth, as estimated by what it has been paying in the way of taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you would get that, then, on the single-tax plan?

Mr. STARR. I would apply the single-tax plan to it. I doubt if you could get it all that way.

The CHAIRMAN. What would it cost, though, at the market price, the way land is ordinarily obtained?

Mr. STARR. It would not cost the Government any more with that bill than it does under this, because the Government holds title to all the land, and the land is always good for its cost.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean lands here in the East that you refer to. What would it cost per acre to secure that?

Mr. STARR. Some of it can be secured for \$8, or \$10, or \$12, or \$15, and \$25—I imagine \$25 an acre would be the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the average?

Mr. STARR. Well, say, \$15 an acre—\$16.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres would you propose to secure?

Mr. STARR. For each individual?

The CHAIRMAN. For the entire plan?

Mr. STARR. Your entire plan? You don't know any more about what that is in this bill than I know about mine.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean how many acres do you propose to acquire?

Mr. STARR. I propose to acquire enough acres to give the man who wants an opportunity to support himself on the land—to give him that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. What would that aggregate?

Mr. STARR. It depends on how many soldiers will take advantage of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are embracing every one?

Mr. STARR. It depends on how many people take advantage of it.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you think would take advantage of it?

Mr. STARR. I imagine if this bill were now ready to put into operation, in workable form, there might be between now and next March 1,000,000 applications for land.

The CHAIRMAN. A million applications?

Mr. STARR. Yes; and the possibility of anywhere from 60 to 80 acres average for individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, 60,000,000 acres?

Mr. STARR. Sixty million acres; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, the plan is not going to stop within one year, nor would your plan.

Mr. STARR. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres would you ultimately have to secure in order to consummate your plan?

Mr. STARR. You would have to secure sufficient acreage to remove from the congested centers of population enough or a sufficient number of those who inhabit the congested centers of population to raise the level of wages in the city to the equal of what they could make living on the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. How much would that be? Could you give the concrete figures?

Mr. STARR. The average labor turnover in this country amounts to about—before the war, in normal conditions—conditions have been

abnormal since and are abnormal now, but they are going the other way—but in normal times and normal conditions there was about 20 per cent of the available labor supply of the country continually idle—not the same individuals by any means, but in the aggregate about 20 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. How many would that be in number that you propose to take care of?

Mr. STARR. There are 120—counting out the women, there are supposed to be 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 of wage workers in the country all the time available for wage purposes. Now 5 per cent of that—10 per cent of that will accommodate the overflow.

The CHAIRMAN. That is 2,000,000.

Mr. STARR. Two million; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would need 2,000,000 farms?

Mr. STARR. You would need 2,000,000 farms. You have got 6,000,000 farms now and you would need 2,000,000 more farms.

The CHAIRMAN. What would each farm cost?

Mr. STARR. Each farm ought to cost, say, at 60 acres to the farm, which is a modest estimate, 60 acres to the farm—say, 60 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. About \$1,000 each?

Mr. STARR. At \$1,000 apiece it would be about \$2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if we could not secure enough appropriation at the start to consummate your plan you would give the preference right to the soldier?

Mr. STARR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. On those lands?

Mr. STARR. Yes; I would.

The CHAIRMAN. And you believe that if only a limited appropriation could be secured by Congress for this purpose that the soldier should have the preference right?

Mr. STARR. Certainly. I would like to emphasize the suggestion made by Mr. Garner yesterday, the gentleman from Texas—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That is what we are trying to do under this bill.

Mr. STARR. Before undertaking a wholesale program on the basis of this bill, if you will experiment, try it out, try it on the dog, if you are going to get men and offer them lands, cut-over lands, swamp lands, and arid lands, you have got to find out how many of them are going to go there.

The CHAIRMAN. You are really in favor of this bill, as far as it goes?

Mr. STARR. I am in favor of the principle of this bill and have been in favor of the principle, this principle, in all of the bills that have been introduced.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you got any other suggestions to make other than to make it nonalienable and also make it apply to everybody?

Mr. STARR. Those are the vital suggestions. Those are the important features.

Mr. TAYLOR. You haven't anything else?

Mr. STARR. Now, this volunteer—I have taken up more time than I intended by a long ways already.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, Mr. Starr, your criticism upon the prodigal and lavish donation of land prior to the Civil War—

Mr. STARR (interposing). I am not criticizing that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you in your criticism, and we are trying to correct the very mistakes that were made at that time.

Mr. STARR. Certainly. Now, those lands were given 20 years before the philosophy that I am preaching was formulated. We were living in a stone age.

The CHAIRMAN. We did make lavish donations of these lands prior to the Civil War, and did not require in many cases settlement and cultivation, and it did lead to land speculation, and that is the very thing we are trying to avoid under this bill.

Mr. STARR. I think you are right about that. Now, I will be very glad if I can answer any other questions. I want to say to you, gentlemen, if I can without being misunderstood, that I have absolutely no interest in this bill personally, for my own benefit, of any kind. I have been a student of these questions for a great many years. No man that ever wore the single-tax button has not been a student of these things, and we realize. I think, all of us, that the very fundamental question is opportunity, opportunity, opportunity. This America meant opportunity 50 years ago, and that is what made it possible for our population to grow as it has.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Starr, you have had a full, free hearing, haven't you? You have said everything you wanted to and have had a very fair hearing?

Mr. STARR. I thank you, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. We just wanted that to go into the record. There has been some complaint about that.

Mr. STARR. I appreciate that. Now, there is one thing I do want to say, when you call my attention to that. I am informed that there was a representative of the National Grange before this body, a Dr. Atkeson, concerning whose testimony there has been some confusion of one kind or another. Now, I know Dr. Atkeson: I have known him for years; but I think Dr. Atkeson and the people he represents take a very wrong attitude and an untruthful attitude—I don't mean intentionally but one that is not sound—when he objects to this bill or any bill of this kind on the ground of the fear of competition with the already established farmers.

There is absolutely no basis for that. It is possible there may be some one or two benighted individuals who are farming somewhere and think they have got a monopoly on some special crop and don't want anybody else to get into the business, but that is not the attitude of the farmer of this country. I can say to you without presumption and without arrogance that I believe that the one vast, undefiled reservoir of idealism still left in this country is right in the heart of the American farmer, and if there is a body in the country that wants the whole country to prosper, it is the farmer; if there is anyone who wants to see justice done at all, it is the farmer. He has been the victim too long of discriminations of various kinds not to want to see justice done to all, because when that is done his condition will be immensely better than it is.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your statement Mr. Starr.

Mr. FERRIS. Fearful that there might be some misunderstanding during the great debate in Congress when the Mexican War was

under consideration, and to show how great men can be deceived about what the country has in store for them, these are the words of Daniel Webster in the debate at that time:

What do we want of that vast and worthless area, that region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands, whirling winds, dust, cactus, and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put those great deserts and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting?

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word. We have one man here that represents the farmers, who doesn't want this bill to go through, because the farmers fear competition. Here we have another man who is a witness here and has just taken his seat, who is dead against this bill because it doesn't include everybody giving the individual the same advantage that the soldier has. Here we have a great statesman saying of the entire West that no one would look at that land; that it could not be used for anything.

I merely offer this to show that from a variety of opinions this committee has got to get down to business on this bill and take it up section by section, paragraph by paragraph, and take some affirmative action on it. Bringing that up to the point of what you want to do, Mr. Chairman, I very greatly hope that it will be your opinion and the opinion of the committee that hereafter when men come in here to assail this bill, and who are objecting to and opposing this bill, that they bring to us some specific amendment that they are in favor of it, and offer it and speak to that, and not try to change the name of Arkansas and paint the sky blue and change the course of the stars and the revolutions of the earth, and inject all these wild theories into the question. The conduct of certain of our citizenship within the last two or three days has been such that there is no need of anybody with a very good temper to hear these theoretical schemes that have no place here and can not be worked out here and are not in the jurisdiction of this committee to develop. I merely throw that in for what it is worth.

The CHAIRMAN. I think, Mr. Ferris, that we got some very valuable suggestions from the last witness. I think that he demonstrated that he was in favor of our plan, as far as it went, and that it did not go far enough. I think that in some particulars he was a very helpful witness. He showed what could be done in these Eastern States and these Northern States. His objection was to the limited operation of the bill.

Now, as to your statement about Daniel Webster, it is very helpful. I used that once and was called to account for it by a historian at one time. I know it is currently published from time to time that Webster did say that, but it has been denied, but Benton is reported to have made a statement but he afterwards changed his viewpoint, because he became the greatest advocate of the development of the West. He is reported to have said:

Let the statue of the fabled god Terminus be erected on the summit of the Rocky Mountains to mark the western boundary of the Republic, and never to be thrown down.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, while I don't want to express my own opinion, it is the opinion of a sergeant by the name of John Kepler, who is at Gen. Pershing's headquarters in the Intelligence Di-

vision—he is now connected with a soldier's paper that has some 50,000 circulation. He called on me yesterday and he confirmed the idea that the land should be open to everybody, and this is his argument: That not over 20 per cent will take advantage of this land.

That is the conclusion that is practically reached here by the figures of Mr. Lane and different ones. Therefore 80 per cent of the people, or the soldier boys themselves, will stay in the cities. Now, if you open this land to everybody, to everybody including the foreigners and those Austrians, Germans, and Italian people who would really go out and work the land, then that will open up four times as much opportunity and advantages in the cities because more people leave the cities to go to the country, and the cities is where 80 per cent—that is where the real help will be done for the soldier. I asked him if he didn't think that if we opened this up for three years exclusively for soldiers, and then if they didn't settle it fast enough, to open it up to the public at large, if he would be satisfied. He thought at first that the soldier should have it all, but he said he would be satisfied with that.

Mr. MAYS. Twenty per cent would exhaust the opportunities, would it not?

Mr. BAER. Twenty per cent will go on the farms anyway.

Mr. SUMMERS. Did your friend realize that this would only take care of 2 per cent of the soldiers?

The CHAIRMAN. Now, were you one of the witnesses? How much time do you want?

Mr. BRANNIN. About 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state to the committee your name and occupation?

STATEMENT OF MR. CARL BRANNIN, SECRETARY OF THE FARMERS' SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

Mr. BRANNIN. I am secretary of the Farmers' Single Tax League. I just want to take a few minutes to bring to the committee's attention some points that Mr. Starr did not fully develop—that is, arguments in substantiation of his position that this bill should contain some provision for the taxation of land values to prevent land speculation, and that it is very inadvisable to have land let out to soldiers and sailors on a fee simple basis.

In the first place, I desire to submit some quotations from different experts and documents. Here is a report of the California Commission on Immigration and Housing, discussing the situation of large land holdings in southern California. There is just a paragraph here that I want to read with regard to the land colonization plan. It reflects the experience of this commission, based on the results in California of their land colonization scheme, and it is fair to say that they have only gone into that matter in a very limited way, only a few thousand acres—three or four thousand. This commission says that the colony plan necessarily accepts the current speculative price of land; and in discussing this plan, as it has worked out in California, this is their criticism [reading]:

There is nothing in the plan aimed to the depression of this price or the correction of the terms upon which land is generally sold to settlers in the States. The board, it is true, obtained favorable terms and no doubt a re-

duction in price on the land which it bought, but it is notorious that any concession made in this matter has been prompted by the expectation of a rise in land values in the vicinity of the settlement. In response to the board's proposal to purchase lands many large landholders, not less than 40 in 17 counties, hurried forward with offers of tracts aggregating 200,000 acres, and this eagerness was manifested in spite of the fact that the terms stated by the board were exceptionally unattractive in the eyes of the average California land merchant. Thus, for any modification of current terms and prices obtained by the board for its own settlers there will be a corresponding increase in prices and a stiffening of terms for settlers elsewhere. The crying evil of high prices and short terms of payment throughout the State remains the same.

Then in the third paragraph it discusses this land colonization system as follows:

It offers small encouragement to the poor man. A late statement is to the effect that the applicant for a farm must have at least \$1,500 capital, and he is advised that an amount of from \$2,000 to \$2,500 would be still better.

If the social purpose is to open the lands of California to those who most need it, this plan surely does not meet the final test.

I think that this is pertinent to the discussion of this bill because of the fact that, as I understand it, a prospective settler, under the plan before this committee, would have to put up a certain amount, and it has been stated that it will possibly be about \$1,500. I don't know whether that is the right estimate or not, but if it is the experience of the California commission with a plan calling for a similar initial payment should be considered.

Mr. RAKER. Who issued this publication?

Mr. BRANNIN. It is issued by the California Commission of Immigration and Housing. This has the date mark 1919, and is published at the California State printing office, Sacramento.

Now, the constructive suggestion of this commission is right in line with the position of the Farmers' Single Tax League, and the position that Mr. Starr has taken for some form of land-value tax. The commission proposes a graduated land tax as the best agency to break up land speculation in California. I simply bring that in not to go into the argument but as a suggestion. That is the attitude of those people who have made quite a deep study of it.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, can we properly take up the question of taxation here?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we don't want to go into the question of single tax.

Mr. BRANNIN. Well, gentlemen, my idea is not to introduce an academic subject, but to emphasize the importance of a consideration of the power of taxation to do the thing which was mentioned yesterday—to prevent land speculation in the working out of this project. Now, some one mentioned the fact, or spoke of it as being a theoretical question. That may be true in a way, and yet I could quote you and would like to have the time, if the committee will not object. I would like to bring in here some of the practical experiences—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). Before you pass the California matter, that theory was defeated by the people of California at the last election?

Mr. BRANNIN. Yes; it has been voted on two or three times in California.

Mr. RAKER. And defeated quite heavily, wasn't it?

Mr. BRANNIN. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. It will be voted on again, won't it?

Mr. BRANNIN. It will be voted on again, yes; and increasingly as time goes on.

Now, I would like to bring in here the experience of an irrigation district in California, of several irrigation districts, totaling something like a million acres. This was a report issued in 1914, and I have seen nothing to indicate that there has been any change in the feeling of the people in these districts since. This is a statement issued in 1914 by the city trustees of Oakdale, Calif., about 8,000 acres in the district, signed by all the directors of the district, the board of trade, women's improvement club, bankers, etc., giving their experience with the single-tax idea in doing away with land speculation, and in encouraging the small home owner in making use of the land and discouraging the building up of large estates.

The Oakdale irrigation district was organized as a single-tax irrigation district under the laws of the State of California in 1909. The chief argument in favor of organization under the single-tax system for raising revenue for the operation of the system was that the farmers would not be penalized for their industry; that when our farmers improve their land by planting alfalfa, setting out trees and vines, building dwellings and barns, and other improvements, their taxes will not be increased, and that they would pay the same taxes as their neighbors with the same area and policy of land who made no improvements. Even in the short space of less than a year many of the promises made for the single tax have been fulfilled. The large ranch, so common under the old system of taxation, is fast disappearing from our district. Speculators do not buy land here. Each sale is made to an actual settler, who brings his family among us, builds a decent home, better the social conditions of his neighborhood, and adds to the prosperity of the community. Our experience has taught us that the more you relieve improvements from taxation, the quicker the country will improve. Single taxation is the best system of taxation for our farmers. We know that it is making our district a success. All of our farmers favor it, because of the exemption of improvements, and no one in the district wants to go back to the old system. The single-tax system is right because it improves the country. Our farmers put the land to its highest use, the use that is most beneficial to the community. Our system of taxation compels them to do this, and they thus reap a greater profit for themselves. Many say that they can now afford to borrow money to make improvements which they could not do under the old system.

That is the statement. And the tax rate, it says there, is \$6.20 on the \$100.

Mr. BARBOUR. Can I interrupt there a minute? Do I understand that this tax rate you refer to is the tax rate applied by the county assessor to the land in the Oakdale district?

Mr. BRANNIN. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. BARBOUR. The county assessor assesses the land in the Oakdale district differently from what he does land in other parts of Stanislaus County?

Mr. BRANNIN. I understand there was an act passed through the legislature which gave a degree of home rule in taxation in that particular district.

Mr. BARBOUR. And that theory is applied only to land in the Oakdale district, and not to the other land in Stanislaus County?

Mr. BRANNIN. As I understand this statement, there are several irrigation districts, the Modesto district, the Oakdale district, the Turlock district and several others, involving about 1,000,000 acres.

Mr. BARBOUR. And the Patterson district?

Mr. BRANNIN. I don't remember that name.

Mr. HERSMAN. That is a private scheme.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes, sir. That is a private scheme.

Mr. BRANNIN. Now, I want to bring in here, gentlemen—it will take just a minute—the recommendation for the taxing of land values adopted by the Ohio State Federation of Labor at its recent reconstruction convention, simply to show that the single tax, or the land value tax idea, is not in a theoretical state. It is receiving the attention of organized workers all over the country and is being made an integral part of their demands. This is a convention of the Ohio State Federation of Labor:

We maintain that the existence of idle land and idle labor constitute a travesty on the intelligence and common sense—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). Mr. Chairman, in order that I may set myself right, I want to enter my protest just as one member of this committee against taking up the time of the people and spending their money here to hear the single tax theory discussed. Now, I don't ask that it be adopted, but I enter my protest against it in order that it may be on record here.

Mr. MAYS. I don't think it has any place here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes, and of course the committee is not going to take up the matter of single tax, but I think we would get through quicker by letting him complete his statement.

Mr. MAYS. How many minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. BRANNIN. To continue:

We maintain that the existence of idle land and idle labor constitute a travesty on intelligence and common sense, and in order that such a paradox shall no longer exist, we insist that it is the duty of our Government, National and State, to take immediate steps to democratize land distribution and reduce the speculative value of land.

The Chicago Labor Party's position is this:

The payment of the current expenses of Government by a system of taxation of land values, which will stimulate rather than retard production.

And the position of the American Labor Party of Greater New York is as follows:

To provide sufficient revenue, we favor the use of a taxation system which will derive the revenues from land values in such a way as to stimulate rather than retard production.

The Washington State Grange has gone on record in its thirtieth annual convention as follows:

The convention of the Washington State Grange reaffirms the historic tax platform of this organization for a straight land value tax.

The American Society of Equity is on record in favor of a graduated land tax.

In same way the Farmers' National Council has declared for the taxation of land values in such a way as to discourage land speculation.

The CHAIRMAN. Your time is up, Mr. Brannin.

Mr. BRANNIN. If I might have just a minute to kind of put a cracker on a few things I have said, I would appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's time will be extended one minute.

Mr. BRANNIN. My hope was that the committee would forget the attitude held by many with regard to reform in taxation, especially with regard to the single tax—classing it as a theory, dismissing it because it had a name that had come to be unpopular—and would consider it on its merits. In view of the experience of other countries, in view of the experience in a limited way in this country, I had hoped the committee would see that if you want to do away with land speculation in any plan for bringing the land to the soldier, or getting the soldier on the land, you must use the power of taxation or you must fix on some scheme that will discourage speculation and encourage the use and development of land. Now, it seems to me that in this colony idea this could be done if the title to the land remained in the Government, as Mr. Starr and Mr. Kent have suggested, and if you would follow the general practice for the development of irrigation and drainage projects, based on the benefit district idea, and establish a benefit district around these farm colonies so that the landowner who happens to live adjacent to such colonies will not get the benefit of the industry and progress of the members of that community, through the increase in the value of his land.

The CHAIRMAN. Your time is up.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the gentleman who has just spoken whether he has anything further to say on the bill that is now pending before the committee, or upon the question of the legislation in regard to soldiers' settlements, or the homestead bill?

Mr. BRANNIN. Why, I could take—I would be glad to have more time here.

Mr. RAKER. Have you anything further to say on this bill, or this proposed legislation?

Mr. BRANNIN. Before the committee?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. BRANNIN. No, sir; I have nothing more, since my time has expired.

Mr. RAKER. No; that isn't the question. I am asking you now—whether the time has expired or not—whether you have anything further to say that would be of interest and assist the committee and is pertinent to this bill?

Mr. BRANNIN. Why, I have a number of things that I would like to have said.

Mr. RAKER. That relates especially to this legislation?

Mr. BRANNIN. Emphasizing the idea I spoke of there of this benefit district plan.

Mr. RAKER. But I don't want you to leave, and I don't want your association to say that you didn't have an opportunity to be heard before this committee.

Mr. BRANNIN. I won't say that. I will answer your question in that way.

Mr. RAKER. If you will say that you have anything to say pertinent on this bill and would like to present the matter further that would assist the committee in getting proper legislation, then I am going to make a motion that you be given further time.

Mr. BRANNIN. Well, I thank the committee for the time, and am glad to say we are satisfied.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Brannin, before you go, one question just for my own satisfaction. You speak about compelling the soldier to pay a larger tax on these lands that he gets. Do you believe it is not proper to tax personal property at all?

Mr. BRANNIN. No, sir; we don't believe in the taxation of personal property.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to know. Then if a lawyer earns \$100,000 a year, you are not in favor of taxing that income of \$100,000?

Mr. BRANNIN. I will say this, as an individual, that there is a difference between the attitude of the single taxer and the single-tax philosophy. As an individual, under the present system of society, I believe in a drastic income and inheritance tax. I don't know as I would make it over \$100,000, but the single-tax philosophy doesn't contemplate any other tax except the tax upon land values. It exempts improvements because it is based upon the idea that what a man has represents what he has earned; that he is not taking advantage of some special privilege, nor taking advantage of some other individual.

Mr. TILLMAN. You don't think that these vast industries that have been built up by reason of the war should pay for that benefit?

Mr. BRANNIN. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. But you would do away with the \$60,000,000 that we get by reason of our income from personal property, and the land should bear all this taxation?

Mr. BRANNIN. Under the present situation, I believe in a drastic income and inheritance and land value tax, to take care of the war debt, and with no other taxes on industries, or improvements, or business, or any thing else.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then you think it would be doing the soldier a kindness to give him 100 acres of land and tax him to death to pay the war tax on it?

Mr. BRANNIN. Not tax him to death; only tax the land according to its value. If the soldier has very valuable lands, he should pay taxes in proportion, because the idea would be that he would be getting a certain benefit from the use of that very valuable land which would more than compensate him.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all.

Mr. FERRIS. Just a word, on the bill. You are the secretary of the Farmers' Single Tax League?

Mr. BRANNIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And Mr. Starr, who preceded you, is President of it?

Mr. BRANNIN. He is chairman of the league.

Mr. FERRIS. You heard his statements wherein he said he was in favor of having the bill made applicable to everybody?

Mr. BRANNIN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you share that same view?

Mr. BRANNIN. I take this position that the bill should be made applicable to everybody, with preference given to the soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. What sort of preference?

Mr. BRANNIN. Well, some one suggested three years. I don't remember just the details, but anything that is reasonable, that will insure that the soldier gets first chance.

Mr. FERRIS. The other thought was that title to the land should not pass from the Federal Government at all, and that the soldier should have a leasehold or something of the sort. You are of the same opinion about that?

Mr. BRANNIN. I am, and let me say this, that under our present system of land tenure the tendency is all toward farm tenancy. Every year sees an increase, according to the census figures, of the farms operated by tenants, and fewer farms operated by owners. Now, if the present system discloses that condition, why should we be fearful of trying the other idea of letting the title remain in the Government, with the provision that a man shall pay ground rent each year, be given absolute security in the possession and use of that land, and not be exploited as he is under the present system?

Mr. HERSMAN. May I ask one question? You heard the statement of the gentleman over here that this bill that is before the House would only take care of 2 per cent of our soldiers first. Now, evidently you must be in favor of this bill, because you say that the soldiers should be taken care of first. This bill only takes care of 2 per cent of them, and evidently you can have no objection, if, under this bill, it only takes care of 2 per cent through the bill.

Mr. BRANNIN. Well, I favor the bill with the objections I have made as regards to leasehold title and making its general provisions open to all, and giving the soldiers preference.

Mr. HERSMAN. You can't make the provisions open to all, because it will only take care of 2 per cent of the soldiers. Then you would have to have another appropriation to take care of more.

Mr. BRANNIN. If the bill is drawn so that it applies that way, I don't see why there is any particular point there.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Brannin, I understood you to say that this system of taxation that is being applied in the Oakdale reclamation district has been very successful?

Mr. BRANNIN. I am taking this statement here for it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I didn't know there was any distinction made as to land situated in the Oakdale district, but isn't it a fact that the people of Stanislaus County have voted down this single tax proposition by a big majority every time it was submitted?

Mr. BRANNIN. I admit I am not familiar with the vote in California by counties.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, I wish to introduce to you ex-Gov. Gooding, of Idaho.

STATEMENT OF HON. F. R. GOODING, OF GOODING, IDAHO.

Mr. GOODING. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I am representing an association that was formed about 60 days ago for the purpose of encouraging legislation recognizing the soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. For the records, you were governor of the State of Idaho for how many years?

Mr. GOODING. For two terms.

That association at the present time has about 20,000 members and is growing all the time. My State appropriated \$100,000 to work in cooperation with the Government, doing those things that it may find to do, not in the way of construction, because all of our projects out there are big and will be expensive.

The first object of our organization is to encourage the passage of some legislation along the line that you have in the bill before you. Then again the hope that Idaho is going to share with the other States in the Union in this great development. I have been impressed, Mr. Chairman, as I have been sitting here for two days listening to the arguments, that this committee is intensely interested in this bill; that you feel it is the most important legislation that has ever been before Congress on land matters. You want it right, and you want the spirit of it right all the way through.

Mr. Chairman, it might be well for me to qualify as a witness by giving you some of my life's work. My early boyhood days were spent upon a farm in Michigan. Later in life, but still in my boyhood days, I went to California and worked on great wheat ranches in the Sacramento valley. Judge Raker, in those days 40 years ago, it was the custom on some of those ranches to eat two meals by candle-light the year round, and when the harvest was on we ate our dinner in the shade of the header wagon.

Then in 1881 I went to Idaho, when it was still a territory. In 1889 Mrs. Gooding and I homesteaded near the town of Gooding. It was during my two terms as governor that the great development in irrigation took place in my State under the Carey Act. During that time the Government was doing a great work out there, and I like the bill that is before you—at least. I like the administration part of the bill, because a great deal of it is going to be left to the Secretary of the Interior, and through him and under him the Reclamation Service. The people of my State, and I believe the people of the West, have confidence in Mr. Lane. They like him, and the people have confidence in the Reclamation Service, for in my State they have constructed the highest masonry dam in the world. Associated with the Government at the present time are engineers who were associated with the State when it constructed under the Carey Act the biggest irrigation canal in the world, with the exception of those built by the British Government in Egypt. All the work, so far as Idaho is concerned, that has been done by the Government, has inspired confidence, so that the people of Idaho feel that you are starting out in this great work with an organization that knows just exactly what to do. We have had much to do with the human part of this great development—which, to my mind, is the most important part of it all, and that is what I want to discuss with you very largely.

I don't like altogether the spirit of the bill under discussion. I think its lines are rather too hard. I feel that you make the initial payment too much. I am afraid you are going to make it impossible for some of the boys who have answered their country's call in this great war to make homes upon these new projects.

I believe that 90 per cent of the people of this country are asking that you shall recognize the soldier very fully in this bill. I do not think there is any question about that. I have never heard any objection, Mr. Chairman, until I heard it stated before this committee. I have made it my business to feel the pulse of the people on every occasion that I find an opportunity. I have found them practically unanimously in favor of recognizing the soldier in our land laws in the future.

There are three provisions in this bill that I want to discuss with you and offer suggestions. I want to be constructive, and I know the committee wants something to go out to the people that has the right spirit in it toward the soldiers. You are making him a party to the greatest development this country has ever known, and you want him to have the feeling that he is a party with the Government in the biggest work that it has ever undertaken in increasing the productiveness of the soil. We must not forget, Mr. Chairman, these young men have given up considerable time, at a dollar a day, to save their country. Some of them may have had some savings before the war, but the chances are that it is all gone. They are starting to-day, many of these young men, with practically nothing but their two hands. They may be married. I hope they are, for I should like to see this bill provide that the soldier who has a family shall be given the first chance, for I want to tell you that the young man can not succeed on the farm without a wife. It is a work for two, and not for one. I think this Government should do those things on all occasions, so far as it can, to encourage the young man to get married, and if this provision were in the bill it would be an encouragement. This bill provides that the young soldier who is the owner of a farm shall not participate in this bill, and in this provision I agree with you thoroughly.

As I understand the bill, you want to give the young soldier who has very little in this life a chance to make a home on these new projects. For a soldier to take advantage of this bill when he enters into a contract with the Government, if he is to make a home in the West, that will cost the Government \$100 an acre to put water on it, and the unit is 80 acres, which I believe it should be in most cases, he will need \$400 for his initial payment. This bill provides that the Government may loan him not more than \$1,200 for building a home and other improvements, of which he shall furnish 25 per cent; it also provides, as I understand it, that the Government will loan the applicant \$800 for the purchase of live stock, of which he must furnish 40 per cent. This means that a soldier must have practically \$1,000 or more to qualify as an entryman. If he has a family, he is not going to be able to save much working on your reclamation projects, wherever they may be, in the East or in the West, at \$4 a day. You are asking him to pay 5 per cent of the selling price of his farm when he enters into a contract with the Government. I think that part should be changed. I believe the first initial payment on the land should be deferred for five years, for the Government is not taking any chances with the young soldier who is trying to build a home on these new projects. Every day's work that he puts upon the farm he is making this a bigger and a better country. There is no chance for the Government to lose. He can not save this amount of money while working on any project in this country unless his work is to extend over a number of years.

There will be seed to buy, and he must establish a home. There is furniture and a hundred different things to purchase when you start a new home. And then there may be a baby coming along about that time, and there will be a doctor bill to pay. All these things, Mr. Chairman, should be taken into consideration in framing this bill. If the young soldier is to succeed there should be an initial

payment, but it should not be more than \$250, and that \$250 should be put into live stock, into the home and the barn; then with the advance the Government should make, he could make a fair start. I want to see the provisions of this bill made as easy as possible so that the young fellow who is without a dollar to-day in his pocket may take advantage of it. I should regret, and I am sure that this committee would regret, to find that some fellow was not able to get married because he did not have a dollar to start in housekeeping with, and that he was forced to pay this Government every penny in his possession before he could commence to try and make a home.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is true that any citizen of this country can go to Canada and may get just as reasonable terms from that Government as is offered in this bill. It is my understanding that that Government is offering great inducements for new settlers.

I have seen land sold out West without any payment down, and no one was the loser, and we must not forget the soldier who goes on these projects is going to make this a bigger and better country, and we must give him a chance to succeed. I do not know whether I have made myself clear on this matter, but I am sure that I am right. I have lived on an irrigation project for a number of years, Mr. Chairman, and I have seen the human side with its privations and hardships—that always comes to a pioneer. The provisions of this bill should be made as easy as possible, and at the same time safeguard the interest of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. You think there should be some initial payment?

Mr. GOODING. I think likely \$250 would be enough, Mr. Chairman. If he wants to have buildings and equipment that will cost \$2,000, then I would say \$500. But I would keep that entirely within his means, and I would make a provision, if he has not even that much, if I could in the bill, that the Secretary of the Interior might recognize him if he is worthy, for a young man might work two years or more on the project and then have sickness in his family. I should like to see this bill give the Secretary of the Interior authority to take all such matters as this into consideration, so that no young soldier will be left without a home after he has made an honest effort.

The CHAIRMAN. Initial payment is required at the present time under the Government reclamation law.

Mr. GOODING. That should be changed. I know one of the greatest hardships to our people in the West has been the first payment. That has been the hardest payment of all to make. It has been a mistake, in my mind, as I have seen the development of that great country out there. It is then he needs the help. That money the Government takes from him he will need in many cases while he is working to make this a bigger and a better country.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, right there, is it not your experience, Governor, with the young men, that those that have \$2,000 or \$1,000, or a good position, would not want to go on a farm? The fact is, a fellow would be down and out before he would go out and work on a farm now days. So that carries out your theory that a small payment is the only way we can get at it?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; you are wanting to take care and help the fellow who needs help. That is the spirit you should want to get in this

bill all the way through. The making of the man, the making of the home, the opportunity, and that is all you are giving him—an opportunity, and I would not be for the bill, Mr. Chairman, if it did more than give him an opportunity. I do not think the soldier is asking for any more than an opportunity. I hope this Congress, or some Congress, will recognize all the soldiers—not the man who wants to go on the farm alone, but when you come to give something more than an opportunity, I think you should give it to all the soldiers, all alike, all the way down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the "soldiers," Governor?

Mr. GOODING. Well, I hope sometime that there will be some act of Congress that will recognize all—possibly by some gift.

The CHAIRMAN. All the soldiers of this war?

Mr. GOODWIN. Of this war, yes.

Mr. BAER. You think by six months' pay like England has done, or Australia and Canada?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; something like that. I think this country could afford to be mighty generous in these matters for, after all, we have grown rich out of this war. There is no question about that. We have occupied an advantage that has given to us the trade of the whole world. The products of other countries have been piled up waiting for transportation; ours have been carried to Europe at big prices. Those young men who have made it possible to look the whole world in the face and say: "I am proud that I am an American citizen," should not be forgotten. I have always been proud of being an American citizen, but there have been times in the past when I have not made much noise about it.

Mr. FERRIS. Are you in favor of taking in everybody, nonsoldiers as well as soldiers?

Mr. GOODING. No; I am not in favor of that at all. I want this bill to recognize the soldiers first of all. That is the spirit of it; that is what the people want.

Mr. FERRIS. You are a Western man; you have been a homesteader and a governor of a great State; you know the country; what do you think of that suggestion made by these single-tax fellows to retain all the title in the Government?

Mr. GOODING. I want to see it tried out over in Russia first.

Mr. FERRIS. You are not in favor of that?

Mr. GOODING. No; it is impracticable and impossible in this country.

Mr. FERRIS. Could the West ever be settled under such a plan as that?

Mr. GOODING. It could not. I really haven't much patience with that idea.

Mr. FERRIS. Don't you recognize that the ownership of an American home is about as high an ideal as a man can have?

Mr. GOODING. It is the highest ideal in the world. It is that which has made this country the grandest country in the world, with the best citizenship in the world.

Mr. FERRIS. Any scheme or theory or plan to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. GOODING. Absolutely. Anything that would destroy that ideal would break down the citizenship of this country. That is what it means. That is the urpose of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Governor, what do you think about the suggestion made by these Spanish War representatives and the Civil War representatives?

Mr. GOODING. I think there is some argument in that. I do not think you need to be alarmed that there are many Spanish-American veterans who would take advantage of it. Most of these men are settled in life. I listened to the argument here the other day, and I was very much impressed—and I think it is true—that after all, our Spanish-American boys have not been considered as fully as they should have been; that they really did suffer through climatic conditions. They were forced to endure medical conditions that science has improved so much in the last few years. I believe they should be provided for in this bill.

Mr. VAILE. They were ready to do all they could. They showed the right spirit.

Mr. GOODING. Yes; they answered their country's call all right enough, and that is the spirit we should encourage.

Mr. BARBOUR. Do you think, Governor, that there would be any objection on the part of the soldiers of our last war if they were included?

Mr. GOODING. I believe they would like to see them included. That is the spirit of the American soldier to-day. He has shown it on every occasion. They were good citizens before they went to war, but they have come back home bigger and better men.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you say about the suggestion made by Congressman Garner of Texas yesterday, concerning the donation of \$5,000 to each man to buy a farm with?

Mr. GOODING. No, that is impractical. I don't believe it could be worked out. I don't think it is workable. I think it would destroy the spirit of all this work that you are trying to do if you should do that. That is why I say that I hope this Congress will recognize the soldier in a substantial way, the same as other countries are doing, and recognize them all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Governor, have you found any opposition to this bill among the farmers that you have met, on account of the possible competition it might bring about?

Mr. GOODING. No; the first proposition of that kind that I heard of was after I had reached Washington, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the head of the Grange objected to the homestead law and practically all other land laws that have done so much for the development of the West. It was not our homestead laws that brought about the development of the West. It was the building of the great transcontinental railroads, and the building of their branch lines that brought into productiveness the greatest country the world has ever known, all within a few years. I think it can be said that the farmers of the East did suffer from this mighty development, but that can not be helped. Nothing could have held back the development of that great country.

Mr. BAER. Isn't it true, though, Governor, that the men who left these lands were not the actual owners, but rather the tenants; that the actual owners were living in the cities and not on the farms?

Mr. GOODING. What is that?

Mr. BAER. Where that emigration went from; that the emigration west was caused by farmers who did not own homes in the East and who wanted to own homes in the West.

Mr. GOODING. I think that the emigration west has been largely made up of young men, as a rule. I think that the western spirit has been more pronounced among the younger men.

Mr. WHITE. I want to make an observation. I have seen it many times, and I think the suggestion is only partially true. I think the men that went west were the sons of those farmers in the East, largely; and while incidentally it works out some injurious competition, the homestead law has worked out the greatest development of any single act that has ever been promulgated and passed by the Government.

Mr. GOODING. There isn't any doubt about it at all. There is another provision of this bill that I want to discuss.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is that?

Mr. GOODING. Just a word on the development of the West. Let me finish that subject by saying that there is no longer any danger of any great development in the West as compared to what we have seen in the last half century. Of the lands left they are only garden spots as compared to what I have seen settled within my lifetime; and within the memory of men in this Congress what is now Chicago was only an Indian trading post, and all that wonderful country out there west of the Mississippi has been settled and, I might say, developed. You are dealing with the future in this legislation that you have before you, and there isn't any question about the needs of this country being developed along the lines of increased production so that we may be able to feed our own people. The most serious questions that come to every Government only come after all its public lands are gone and there is no longer an opportunity to relieve the congested condition of its great cities. We are close to that line at the present time, and our great cities are already congested. The one great effort of this Government should be to make new homes upon the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. You said there were three matters that you wanted to speak of especially. Will you just give them to us in order?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; I want to discuss the cost of construction. I want to call your attention to the cost of administration, and then I want to take up that spirit in this bill that I don't like, in which you practically take the soldier and tie him down and say: "You are going to stay there ten years," if I read the bill aright, "before you will have a right to mortgage it, or have a right to lease it, or before you will have a right to sell it, or do anything else with it, unless you get the consent of the Secretary of the Interior." Mr. Lane may not always be Secretary of the Interior, and those who have had to deal with the red tape of the Government who are thousands of miles away know that it is mighty slow sometimes. I want to get that spirit out of the bill, but I want to first discuss with you the cost of construction. Our Reclamation Service, all the cost of that department is charged up to the homesteader.

The cost of maintaining the office here in Washington, Mr. Davis's salary, all of his consulting engineers, all of the work of putting the projects on paper are all charged up against the man who goes out to make a home on a Government project. I know of no other

department of the Government in this country that charges to the individual the expense of its administration. I believe that all the expense of the Reclamation Service should be met by a direct appropriation. We spend millions of dollars for improving our rivers and harbors; for building great levees to keep the water off the land, but if anyone who receives the direct benefit of this expenditure ever pays a dollar into the Government Treasury for it I have not been advised of it. I believe that the homesteader should properly pay for the cost of construction, but that the administration of the Reclamation Service should be as free to the homesteader as is the service of a hundred other departments of the Government to every citizen that it benefits and many receiving direct benefits.

This Government maintains a Bureau of Animal Industry. It has an army of employees at high salaries. They inspect live stock and prevent the spreading of many contagious diseases all over the country. Those receiving the direct benefit of it never pay a dollar for this protection. I am not unmindful that the whole country receives the benefit of this service of the Government but this is true also as far as the work of the Reclamation Service is concerned, and the whole country should be taxed to maintain that department.

When you come to this great question of bringing back the fertility of the soil on worn out farms there is going to be a tremendous overhead expense. No farmer, no young man, can accept that expense and make a success upon that farm. The expense will be too great. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that this bill provides a complete control over the land to the extent of crop rotation as long as the title is in the Government. We have reached that period in the history of our country in which no man should be allowed to mine the soil and take out all of the fertility. This supervision would be especially necessary on the worn out farms in the East. I know of no other department of the Government where there is a direct charge to the citizens who are benefited by Government supervision.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is another provision in the bill that I don't like. You seem to want to fasten that soldier down and say to him: "You can't get away; you have got to stay here." This bill provides he shall not be permitted to make any transfers as long as the title is in the Government without consulting some one here in Washington. I believe that the bill should provide that after a man has worked three years on a farm he ought to be given the right to sell his equity in his holdings without consulting anyone. Three years is a long time and it would and there would be no danger of speculation. I would like to see the soldier given this much independence and encouragement. The title to everything he possesses is in the Government. If he has an equity in this three years' work let him sell it. If he wants to let him lease it. The young wife that he may bring from the city to the farm may find it impossible to live upon the farm. Her health might fail. A hundred complications may come up that can only be known to those who have homesteaded or pioneered in this country, so why tie him down and destroy all his independence, and leave him without that feeling that he is a party with the Government in the development that this bill proposes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. May I ask the governor a question? If that policy should be applied, would it not be possible in a short time for this land to get into the hands of those who have never been soldiers, yet they would get the benefit of the long-time payments, and the soldier whose applications are pending would be out?

Mr. GOODING. Well, you have helped the soldier who has first taken the land. Now, I would not want to destroy any of his rights in the matter, or take anything from him by saying that only another soldier should follow him. I think you have got to get more independence in it than that. Don't be alarmed about great land holdings in the West. I mean to say about land-holdings all getting into the hands of a few men. That is not true in my country, where we have had irrigation projects now for the last 30 years. If anything, the units are growing smaller. Occasionally, some fellow, however, is able to farm more than his neighbor, and he buys him out. That is progression, and I want that spirit left with the American people. If you only give him 40 acres and he finds after a while that he can farm 80 or 120 or 160, let him have it if he has the money to buy the other fellow out. Let us continue the American spirit as long as we can. It is that spirit that has made this the best country in the world and given us the greatest citizenship in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Governor, the single-tax representatives said they wanted to prevent the alienation of the land for the purpose of preventing speculation. Is there any speculation to-day in any Government projects?

Mr. GOODING. I don't know of one.

Mr. TAYLOR. There absolutely isn't any speculation. Land may bring high prices, from \$200 or \$300 an acre, but when he sells out, another family comes in and takes his place, and there is nobody trafficking in these things or speculating in these lands now, is there?

Mr. GOODING. No.

Mr. MAYS. Do you have in mind that project in Idaho, Governor, that Mr. Kent referred to as having largely fallen into the hands of speculators?

Mr. GOODING. No; I know of no such projects. There are a few holdings, four or five hundred acres of land—there may be some larger. The large holdings are passing away as a rule in the West as far as cultivated land is concerned.

Mr. FERRIS. Governor, you laid down two propositions that are attractive on the surface, and probably right, but I think you have given this committee a pretty hard task by proposing to take away all the overhead taxes.

Mr. GOODING. Just for administration.

Mr. RAKER. But I am speaking of the present proposition. The second proposition is giving them an absolute fee simple title at the end of three years whether they have paid for it or not.

Mr. GOODING. No; he must pay for the land in full. I am only asking that he be given the right to dispose of his equity.

Mr. RAKER. I don't want to give him anything more than an opportunity, that is all.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, perhaps I misunderstand you. You have been sitting here for a day or two yourself; some of us have been sitting here for 12 years and we have had people come before us of all kinds

and characters, with all sorts of views, and what I wanted to impress upon you was the difficulty of not alone converting this committee, but of converting 434 Congressmen and 96 Senators to get through what you want, so you must make our task as easy as you can.

Mr. GOODING. I believe this committee is going to put the right spirit into this bill, because you are, in a way, responsible to the people. You are going to give the people a fair hearing, but when you get through with it you are going to do what the title of the bill asks you to do. You are going to recognize the soldier.

Mr. FERRIS. Precisely. But let us get right back to that proposition, because I thought you laid down two things there that I am in sympathy with. I have been a homesteader; I know conditions out there; but I also know what you have got to do to get any sort of legislation through Congress here. Now, you don't propose to let them out of paying for this, do you?

Mr. GOODING. No; I thought I made myself clear. All I want to do is to give the soldier a chance to dispose of his equity. The holder of the contract must carry out the provisions to the end with the Government.

Mr. FERRIS. What was the criticism you have of the overhead charges against the men?

Mr. GOODING. I may say it is not the policy of the Government in the administration of any of its affairs anywhere to make a direct charge to the citizen who is benefited from that service. The cost of administration of our Government and all of its branches, as I understand it, should be borne by all of the people.

Mr. BAER. I think I can make this a little more clear. I have been on reclamation projects, and have been a civil engineer myself, and I have seen fellows playing lawn tennis and monkeying around when there wasn't anything to do, and the farmers go along by these engineering camps—and they really haven't anything to do at certain times—and these farmers see them out there and they get discouraged and disheartened. They think that cost is being added all the time to their bill. Now, the point is that in the surveys and the preliminary work, and up to the time the farm is turned over, you think the Government ought to pay for the administrative work, the engineering, and all that work?

Mr. GOODING. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, let me make an inquiry here. Of course, I know that Mr. Davis, as director, would not willingly allow his employees to go out and resolve themselves into lawn-tennis parties while they are carrying on the work, but that will occur undoubtedly at times: but if you don't make the fellow who is benefited by it pay for it, where will the Government have as good a check on it as it will to have these homesteaders, some of these reclamation fellows, protest to Director Davis and say: "Here we are paying the bill, and your man, John Jones, who is an engineer, is out here playing lawn tennis."

Mr. GOODING. I haven't heard of anything of that kind.

Mr. FERRIS. You heard it just now. Mr. Baer just now has told us about it.

Mr. GOODING. Well, possibly, it might be somewhere outside of our section. But there is this impression, however, that there is so much

red tape connected with all these affairs of the Government that it makes it very expensive. Now, the point I am making is that in the administration of any other department of Government you have not charged direct to the individual for it. Now, I am merely asking you to give the soldier the same treatment that you give in every other line of industry in this country.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the point you make is that the administration of the law after the initial expenditure has been made, you think that ought to be borne by the Government rather than by the homesteader?

Mr. GOODING. The cost of administration up to the time the project is turned over, should be borne by the Government. What I call administration is Mr. Davis's work, and his corps of engineers, his consulting engineers and the cost that it takes to put the project on paper before actual construction is commenced.

Mr. FERRIS. You mean after the project is turned over?

Mr. GOODING. I mean before. After that I think properly they should pay the maintenance of the project; yes. You understand what I mean, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. You mean the Washington end of it?

Mr. GOODING. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Director Davis and his Washington City force is not paid by reclamation projects.

Mr. GOODING. Yes, they are; every dollar of it.

Mr. BAER. And the engineers are paid by them?

Mr. FERRIS. The engineer and the inspector, of course, that is particularly associated with the project. I don't see how you can separate that from part of the cost. I shouldn't think this administration could be paid from any such fund.

Mr. GOODING. It always has been. That is the policy that I am bringing up, because it is an exception to the rule. This is the only case in which it applies. I will let Mr. Davis take care of that when he comes before you. He can show it better than I can. I want to make myself clear, however, and show you that I have only one thought and that is to help in getting the right kind of legislation.

Mr. RAKER. Committeeman Baer, has made, I think, an unfortunate remark. I am hoping that he will correct it before we get through, and that is that, under the Reclamation Service, men are employed as engineers and other Government officials on the reclamation projects, and that they have used part of the Government time for tennis, and so forth. But I have been on this committee for several years and I have always understood that never existed, that the Government Reclamation Service gets full value from the men they employ; that if they have any fun, a ball game, or tennis, and so forth, they take it out of their own time just like anybody else does, and that they are not soldiering on the Government. Isn't that your experience?

Mr. GOODING. We have a very high regard for them in my State. They have built monuments that will endure to the end of time.

Mr. FERRIS. Do they play lawn tennis at times?

Mr. GOODING. I have seen them play lawn tennis.

Mr. FERRIS. During working hours.

Mr. GOODING. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, they have a right to play then.

Mr. GOODING. I think they are human, just like the rest of us.

Mr. BAER. I will withdraw the statement, as far as the general proposition goes, but there are times—and I said it rightfully when I made the statement—that they have nothing to do and they might play tennis.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, you don't mean now to state before this committee that is the regular practice, and I think you will agree with me that the Reclamation Service is one of the most efficient services in this country, and that the men perform their work and give to the Government a day's labor, a day's service, when they are paid for it; they give a full return, and that they are not idling their time away.

Mr. BAER. I think myself—I have been unfamiliar with the work of this committee, and I think it is a little strong statement to make, but I know the engineers, and I can name the places on the Yellowstone project, for instance, 10 or 12 years ago—I don't know whether Mr. Davis was connected with the administration of the Reclamation Service then, but the point is that there were times when they would have to go out and give a few levels to a contractor and a few grades, and then we would get off and we didn't have anything to do. We were being paid; but, nevertheless, we did it. Now, I am not criticizing that. We were doing our duty, and we didn't have anything to do, but the trouble is that when the farmer pays directly for this, he goes along and sees men, even after 4 o'clock in the afternoon, playing lawn tennis, and he thinks he is paying for all that; and if the Government is paying for it directly, he never seems to realize that he has to eventually pay it himself anyway.

Mr. FERRIS. You think it is perfectly all right for the Government to pay for lawn tennis parties.

Mr. BAER. There are hundreds of positions here in your department any morning, 10 or 11 o'clock, where stenographers are not busy, but that isn't their fault, if they haven't anything to do.

Mr. BAER. I have heard that statement made against the Reclamation Service now for the first time, and individually I have never heard yet where the officials, those under the employ of the Government, were soldiering on the Government and getting paid for doing things that they did in the way of pleasure, and trying to get the Government—in other words, grafting on the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not let the governor conclude, gentlemen?

Mr. GOODING. The last suggestion that I want to make comes, as I believe I said from the fact that you take the young soldier and tie him up to the Secretary of the Interior for 10 years. I think possibly I have made myself clear on that, that he ought to be given the right, after he has spent three years on that project, to sell out and leave. I don't want the boy that goes out to make this country a bigger and a better country to feel that he is tied up with the Government for 10 years, or anyone else, without any right to dispose of his equity, unless it is approved by some Government official.

Mr. FERRIS. But he is doing something with more than his labor. He is doing something with about \$5,000 that the Government has contributed.

Mr. GOODING. The Government has not given him a dollar; oh, no!

Mr. FERRIS. Under this bill it is provided that the Government shall give him something in the way of land and houses, farms and improvements.

Mr. GOODING. But he is paying for it.

Mr. FERRIS. But under your plan he hasn't paid for it when he sells it.

Mr. GOODING. But his contract with the Government holds good. Somebody must fulfill that contract. He is only selling his equity at the end of three years. I want to give him that right to dispose of it as he sees fit after three years.

Mr. FERRIS. We are not passing bills that will cost the Government \$10,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 for the benefit of some one other than the soldier.

Mr. GOODING. The soldier has benefited, but some of them may find it impossible to continue upon the farm. I want to give that fellow a chance to dispose of his equity.

Mr. FERRIS. He may have benefited by selling a couple of years of his own time and gotten a profit on the improvements. We want to avoid that speculative feature.

Mr. GOODING. But no man is going to take up the speculative end of it if you make it three years. I don't want to see you pass a bill here at all unless the soldier accepts it in the right spirit. I think it would be an unfortunate thing for the whole country if you do.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection that would be urged to the early transfer on the floor would be that it would be only a bill to permit the sale of a homestead.

Mr. GOODING. You haven't seen it in practical operation, because in my State that does not hold good. Many people that pioneered that country are still living upon their homesteads.

Mr. FERRIS. Don't you recognize, Governor, a little difference between a project where the Government is proposing to spend four or five thousand dollars on it and the project where the homesteader hoes his own row and pays it all himself?

Mr. GOODING. You are not giving the soldier anything. Let's get away from that idea. You are charging him the full rate of interest for everything. You are only extending him credit; that is all.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you know of any place in Idaho where men can buy an improved farm on 40 years' time at 4 per cent interest?

Mr. GOODING. No.

Mr. FERRIS. And have a job while he is improving it?

Mr. GOODING. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Then we are giving him something.

Mr. GOODING. Yes; you are giving him an opportunity; of course I agree with that.

Mr. SUMMERS. Gov. Gooding, this might not be so serious an objection, it would seem to me, so far as the land itself is concerned, but you are advancing \$1,200 for improvements and \$800 for stock and implements. Now, if this man is to be permitted to sell indiscriminately to any man, how do you know, how does the Government know—what sort of care these things are going to have after they pass out of his hands? That is one objection, it seems to me.

Mr. GOODING. They would have the same supervision that they have had before. They might get a better tenant.

Mr. SUMMERS. They have passed on the man in the first place, but if he sells indiscriminately, they could not pass on his successors.

Mr. GOODING. A provision in the bill by which the Secretary would pass upon this change might be all right.

Mr. BAER. I think that is already in there.

Mr. GOODING. He ought to have the right to sell, the right to lease, and all those things.

Mr. BAER. As I understand it, Governor, there is a provision of that kind in the bill. The objection to that, as I understand it, is the red tape here in Washington. If we could have some kind of quick action on those applications, would that answer the objection?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; that is the objection. And I still want to hold to my thought, if you are going to compel him, after he has put in 3 years there, if he has still got to ask this Government just what he can do after his three years of hard work, there isn't much of a spirit of independence in it,

Mr. HERSMAN. In my understanding, you want to make it as easy as possible on the soldier so that he can succeed on this proposition?

Mr. GOODING. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. The easier you make it for the soldier, the more likely he is to succeed?

Mr. GOODING. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. Now, I can see, as I glance over this bill, from my experience in the West, that we occasionally have failures in crops, and it is very likely to be so on some of these projects. Now, if the soldier has all of his money invested in machinery and in stock, and there should come a failure of his crops, and the Government doesn't provide for taking care of the soldier, making it easy on the soldier, the soldier will either have to give up what he has already done—three or four years of work—or he will have to sell out. Now, I understand that your contention is that you want to make it as easy as possible for that soldier to succeed on that proposition.

Mr. GOODING. I want to give him a chance. I want to give him 3 years' trial on the farm. Now, I think he is going to stick; 75 per cent of them will, possibly more. But if there are any who can't stick, I want to give him a chance so he can dispose of his farm to advantage and sell it. I don't want to see those years wasted.

Mr. HERSMAN. My experience has been that the original one that takes up a proposition of this kind—that 90 per cent of them give up their proposition, 90 per cent of them at least in California, and it goes into the hands of a second class of people, and then afterwards part of them give it up and it goes at last into the hands of a third class; and the reason these people have to give up their lands is because they can't make the payments that are imposed by private parties on these new settlers.

Mr. GOODING. That doesn't hold good in my State.

Mr. HERSMAN. But I believe that if the Government, as you say, gives a soldier an opportunity, a large opportunity to make good he will make good.

Mr. GOODING. He can't make good if you tie him down, if you ask the impossible, which to my mind you are doing in this bill. You must make it easier.

Mr. SMITH. The bill provides that the transfer can be made, but it must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. That is simply a formality to keep in touch with the entrymen.

Mr. GOODING. There isn't the independence about it that I would like to see. I don't think the Government is running any risk as long as the title to all the soldier possesses is in the Government, and those who succeed him would have to pay in fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The theory of this bill is that the man is going to be a picked man, and before he is permitted to go on the project his adaptability to the soil is going to be examined into by the Secretary, and I think there would be objections to waiving that right after a period of three years, and there should be the choice of selection left after the three-year period.

Mr. GOODING. I am merely trying to make him a pretty independent American citizen. That is my idea in connection with it, and that is what he is going to want, and that is what the people are going to want for him. And that is the thought that I have, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your position.

Mr. GOODING. I think you are needlessly alarmed at the thought that the Government is going to lose something. The Government is going to have three years of his work, in which he is going to make this country a bigger and a better country. Don't be alarmed about it. Give him some independence in connection with this great work.

Mr. SMITH. What do you think of the suggestion made by a member of the committee that part of the wages of the soldiers employed on projects be withheld and applied on the price?

Mr. GOODING. I can not agree to that. That is the spirit that I want to see left out of this bill.

Mr. SUMMERS. Wouldn't you think that the original purchaser ought to have repaid the \$800, for instance, for stock and machinery before he is permitted to sell indiscriminately?

Mr. GOODING. I think that is true; yes. I would agree to that.

Mr. SUMMERS. And the bill provides that he has five years in which to pay, so at least you would say he should repay that?

Mr. GOODING. Yes; it would be all right to provide that if he sold out he should pay up his loan to the Government made to him for improvements and live stock.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't think, Governor, that we are merely holding out some lure or will-o'-the-wisp to him?

Mr. GOODING. No; I do not. I am sure that no one could be more sincere, more earnest than you gentlemen are in this matter. I am sure that your desire is only to help the soldier all you can.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been stated in circulars sent around that we are holding out some lure, some will-o'-the-wisp, some gold brick, to the soldier. Do you feel that this is a practical proposition?

Mr. GOODING. I think there isn't any question about it being practical. It will be practical in every State in the Union. The Government has got to take up this great work of reclaiming these lands some time or another, and I think it is a good time to commence, and there is no question about it.

Mr. VAILE. What do you think, Governor, of the suggestion made here by the representative of the grange, that we are doing too much for the agricultural business, and that it is unfair to the farmer?

Mr. GOODING. I can't agree with that at all. I think we must go on. It is your duty to legislate for the future. This country has taken care of itself pretty well in the past. There are vital questions before this Government which must be considered seriously, and the land question, to my mind, is the biggest question of all that confronts the American people to-day. This country must feed itself just as long as it can.

The CHAIRMAN. Another objection that has been urged is that this measure will increase the present scarcity of farm labor. Have you any views on that?

Mr. GOODING. I hope there will always be a reasonable scarcity of labor. I hope we will never have the bread line and soup houses again in America that we have had in the past, and it is up to you gentlemen to legislate wisely to see that we don't have them, because you will hear more bombs then, and these anarchists that we have in the country will become the leaders of the mob with the torch. It is the first great duty of the Government to see that there is work for those that are willing to work. Again I want to say I hope there will always be a reasonable scarcity of labor; that there will always be a chance for a man who wants to work to sell his labor. I hope the time will never come when it will be otherwise.

Mr. HERSMAN. May I ask the Governor one question? Governor, do you think that the average soldier could succeed under the provisions of this bill in a settlement?

Mr. GOODING. I am afraid that he could not meet the initial payment. I do not believe the young man could save enough out of his wages working on any of the projects to make the initial payment as is provided in this bill.

Mr. HERSMAN. You have had large experience in this work. Would you, as a young man, undertake to go into a project like this if you have the money? And under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GOODING. Well, I don't know. It looks hard to me, as I see the situation now after years of experience pioneering on irrigation projects and seeing the ups and downs. I want to see the Government make the lines easy so the soldier can succeed. You know something about it out there, Mr. Mays.

Mr. MAYS. Yes, we have seen it.

Mr. GOODING. There comes sickness and a hundred other things to contend with. The homesteader can have all kinds of bad luck.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. About that initial payment at 5 per cent. That would be on \$5,000, \$250, and that would comply with your idea. Of course, as to the improvements, he may borrow \$1,200, provided he has one-quarter of the value of the improvements. He would have to put up 25 per cent of the \$1,200 for improvements. Then should he want money for stock purposes, he could borrow up to \$800, not exceeding 60 per cent of the cost of the live stock, so he would have to have 40 per cent of the money for live stock.

Mr. GOODING. I want to make the point that it is impossible for the young soldier to make that much working upon any project. He can not save that much. He may have friends that will help him, but you are proposing legislation for the fellow that hasn't a dollar to-day to start with.

Mr. BENTHEM. Governor, why do you not qualify your last statement by saying that if he is in his own community, surrounded by his former neighbors, he would stand a better chance of being helped?

Mr. GOODING. I do not want that in it. You will destroy the spirit of the bill if you do. The soldier is a mighty independent American citizen at the present time. Let us encourage that independence.

Mr. SUMMERS. It has been pointed out here, Governor, that this 25 per cent on improvements might be contributed by his own labor, so that we lend only what he must invest in his horses, cows, and machinery. That brings it down to a smaller sum.

Mr. GOODING. But he has got to live all this time. He has got a hundred things to buy in order to start housekeeping, just think of it. He is building from the ground up without a dollar. Now, what is he going to do? You want to take care of that kind of a boy, but he must pay for his living all the time. If you are going to help that kind of a young soldier and that is what you are proposing to do in this bill, its provisions must be made easier.

Mr. SUMMERS. He may or may not have been a householder before he goes onto this project.

Mr. GOODING. We should encourage him to be a householder, and I hope you will put that provision in the bill, by which you give a married soldier the first chance. I would dislike, and I am sure that you gentlemen would dislike, to feel that you have kept any young fellow who wanted to take advantage of this opportunity from getting married and making a better citizen of himself and providing a home.

Mr. SMITH. Don't you think, Governor, that these young men who will go on these projects and will have employment for a year or two at \$4 a day would be able to save a few hundred dollars?

Mr. GOODING. He is going to need it to buy a plow and a harrow and a team and a hundred other things that you don't provide for—fencing and feed and everything else.

Mr. SMITH. You would rather do business with a man who is reliable and industrious and who had saved his money, even if it took him four or five years to do it, rather than the man who had nothing, wouldn't you?

Mr. GOODING. I don't want to see you do anything that you are discriminating in at all. There are a lot of good young fellows that do not save much until they marry and settle down in this life, and yet at the same time they ought to be given an opportunity. What I am objecting to is the initial payment on the land to the Government.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with you on that.

Mr. GOODING. And the Government is perfectly safe, for you are going to borrow money for less than 4 per cent, if you please, especially if you take the tax off. I feel it was a mistake to have taxed bonds. At least, that is the situation as I see it in the West.

Mr. RAKER. May I ask you if this is your position; that you believe in fee-simple ownership of our homes?

Mr. GOODING. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Any other system is detrimental to our country.

Mr. GOODING. I agree with you; I want to continue, as I say, those conditions and principles that have built up our great citizenship in America.

Mr. RAKER. You believe that the only restriction placed upon these men should be the sufficient guaranty of repayment to the Government of the money advanced?

Mr. GOODING. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And self-determination of the right of transfer from place to place, or moving from place to place, or to sell to be left to the individual American citizen?

Mr. GOODING. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Any other spirit makes tenancy and makes them simply under the guardianship of the Government.

Mr. GOODING. You want to get away from it just as far as you can, and safeguard the Government at the same time.

Mr. RAKER. Your theory, Governor, from your experience in the West, is that any system that will make a tenancy or a guardianship over these men would be detrimental to them and to the country?

Mr. GOODING. It would destroy the object which is in view. There is no question about that. I want to see it start right, because I think we need to do those things all the time. I don't want to see anything done that would tend to give anybody an opportunity to break down that spirit.

Mr. RAKER. Well, you are driving at nails that I want to see driven hard and clear before we get through.

Now, on the further matter after the question of collection, is it your experience from your observation, that the man would do better by selecting what he wants to do if he wants to go to farming, or whether you should have a committee to tell him what he shall do for the future? I want your judgment on that now.

Mr. GOODING. I can't agree with that at all. I am for the old-fashioned spirit of independence, myself, that helps to make the man.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your view that a commission or an authorization to anybody to determine that this soldier should go on a farm and another should not; do you think that should be the plan, or should it be left to the individual soldier whether or not he wants to farm, and, if he wants to comply with the rules and regulations and shows a willingness and disposition and is an honorably discharged soldier, that he should have that right?

Mr. GOODING. I agree to that, but the man who goes on the projects and helps to construct them, and becomes a party to them, should be given the first chance.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but I am asking.

Mr. GOODING. Now, I hope the Secretary will not be too searching in his inspection as to whether I am qualified to do certain things or not. I don't altogether like that, because I have seen all kinds of people, if you please, come to my project, or at least settle in my part of Idaho, and make good, from all lines of industry, all kinds of business, and some of them have failed—that is to be expected.

Mr. RAKER. And you want to give in legislation of this kind to the soldier boys who have got the initiative, the will, and the determination to go there and to make their homes themselves—you want to give him the right to do that as he wants to?

Mr. GOODING. I want to give the soldier as much independence in this bill as can be put into it. I like that spirit. That is what I am talking about, the human interest you must have all the way through if you are going to succeed.

Now, I hope that I have made the committee feel that I am right in spirit, any way. I merely wish to help to get something out that we are going to be proud of later.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish you could put that same spirit into about 425 other voters in this House.

Mr. GOODING. I feel that the House will be all right. I am sure that all want to give the soldier a chance.

Now, there is just one other thing that I am going to ask you to do for the soldiers, if I may. Don't understand me that I am asking you to give him anything. Our Government is appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for roads. I understand that the Government is joining with the States and offering to put up half in the cost of construction. In some States they are building hard surface roads that cost from \$20,000 to \$30,000 a mile. Now, here is something that I would like to see you do: Build the roads on Government projects. It need not be an expensive road. Say a graded road on each section and half section line, with a gravel or crushed-rock surface. It may cost something like \$4,000 a mile. Your bill provides for road building and I anticipate that it is going to be charged up to the homesteader under the bill, unless you make some provision for this construction.

Mr. TAYLOR. You probably don't realize it so much as the rest of us do, and as I have, and as Mr. Ferris has, sitting around this table for the past 10 years, but it is the hardest possible thing on God's earth to pass any constructive, beneficial legislation, to bring it out of the House of Representatives. The East, and the North, and the South have been drenched with Pinchotism and conservatism, and ideas of conserving everything for future generations, and they think it is just like taking a left lung and a right eye out of Uncle Sam for a person to go on and get a home out of this God-forsaken land that there is left, and we have an awful hard time to convince these people and to pass any kind of a bill through; and if we wait to get an ideal measure we will never get anywhere.

Now, I would like to pass a motion now to report this bill out of here and go ahead and do the best we possibly can with it, and amend it and get it through in the best possible way and take chances on amending it in the future. That is the only way we will get anywhere with it. We have got to start somewhere and do the best we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through with your statement, Governor?

Mr. GOODING. I am through, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we have the governor of Oklahoma. Is he in the city?

Mr. FERRIS. He will be very happy to appear to-morrow, Mr. Chairman; he has gone to welcome the soldiers home.

The CHAIRMAN. Then all we have remaining is the governor of Oklahoma, and Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, and a few Congressmen who have expressed a wish to be heard.

Mr. GOODING. I would like to thank the committee for the privilege accorded me.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Governor. We will adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12.30 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, June 6, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, June 6, 1919.

The committee met at 10.15 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we have here Gov. Robertson, of the State of Oklahoma, who will make a statement this morning.

**STATEMENT OF HON. J. B. A. ROBERTSON, GOVERNOR OF THE
STATE OF OKLAHOMA.**

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I don't know that I ought to take up your time; there are so many other men who are better qualified to speak on the subject than myself; but I am so interested in the measure that is now being considered that I feel, in justice to the soldiers, and to my State especially, that I should let you know how the people generally down there feel about this matter.

I am frank to say that in the beginning when this subject was first broached it did not appeal to me very strongly, because we did not understand it, but after having read repeatedly some of the details of the bill and some of the plans of the committee, we are very much interested in it.

Oklahoma sent many thousand soldiers, and a good majority of them are farmers, and I have had occasion to talk with many of them who have returned, and I might say, parenthetically, that I am interested in this matter from two or three viewpoints. First, of course, I want to see the agricultural interests of the State developed. Naturally, there would be some tendency among the soldiers to want something better than they have had in the past. Most of them went away boys and came back men. And I have discovered a large number of them who went off the farm and are not specially interested in the farm any more, because unless they get some help, such as is designed by this bill, they will have to go back in the capacity of ordinary laborers, and that does not appeal to them. In our State we have three or four classes of land—and I am free to say that it is all good land, but it is so situated, for instance, in McCurtain County, we have a large area of what is commonly called cut-over land. It is not cut-over land of large forests like they have in Michigan and Wisconsin, but smaller trees, and it is the most fertile section of the State. The great difficulty we find in developing that is that a single man—I mean a single family—will go in four or five, or six or seven miles away from civilization, so to speak, and try to hew out a home all alone. If we could get 100 or 200 hundred families to go in there and obtain a home of their own, and have some cooperation and assistance from the Government or the State, it would make an ideal community, and in a short time it would be among the best land in the State.

Then we have what is known as "Boggy Valley" land in Coal and Atoka Counties, owned largely by the Indians, segregated lands, and that land likewise has been inaccessible.

In the western part of the State, sometimes called the semiarid portion of the country—but the wheat is that high [indicating] this year on it just the same—it will grow 35 or 40 bushels to the acre, depending, of course, on the season—but the State owns there in one body school land to the extent of something like 350,000 acres, and another tract adjoining it of something like 250,000 acres, and I think there would be no difficulty with the bill, as I understand it now, and with the aid that would be given the soldiers by the State and the Government combined, to develop these tracts to a high state of cultivation in a very short time.

Now, this is not reclamation work at all, as I understand it, but it is simply putting these men in a position to obtain homes for themselves.

I find also in discussing this matter with my people that they did not understand the first plan that was submitted, and for that reason they felt that it called for a large appropriation on the part of the State. We had the matter up in a recent session of the legislature, and while they are all interested in securing homes for the soldier, yet on account of the finances of our State, we did not feel justified in going ahead and making a large appropriation until the Federal Government had blazed the way. The Government had not done it at that time. I am sure that you will find hearty cooperation on the part of our State with the Federal Government in this enterprise.

Now, I have not heard any valid objection, except, perhaps, certain organizations of farmers that think that the Government will attempt to put these extra men into competition with them, and that is a very short-sighted idea, to say the least. There can't be too much production in agriculture, as I see it, and one of the great troubles that confronts us in that new State is the increase in tenantry. We want to stop that if possible, and to that end I suggested to the recent legislature that we attempt to correct it now, and we did establish what is known as the home-ownership law, by which a man with the proper character and reputation and recommendations as to ability and integrity and honesty, and so on, can borrow in our State the full amount—100 per cent, if you please—on land to build a home—make a home out of it. That is to say, out of the permanent school fund we will loan 50 per cent of the appraised value, and if he is the right kind of a man we will loan him an additional 50 per cent out of the special home-ownership fund, and out of this special home-ownership fund we can go a long ways to cooperate with the Government in this matter. We are very anxious not only to reclaim the land, but to reclaim these soldier boys who are coming back, because, I regret to say, that in conversation with many of them I find that since they went away from home, from the farm, and have seen the bright lights of the world, so to speak, they are just a little bit slow about talking of the farm and the drudgery connected with it, unless it can be in the capacity of owner of the land; and I hope this committee can find it within its power to work out some scheme such as is embodied in this bill whereby these soldiers can be taken care of. I have appointed a special committee to work in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior, and they are busy now on it. They would be glad to come here and submit figures as to the number of acres and as to what the State will do in regard to this matter.

I regret that I am not in a position, not having heard any of your discussions and not having had time to study the details of this bill, to go into it more at length, but I do say this, gentlemen, that it is a matter of great importance and interest to Oklahoma—it must be to all the other States. When the matter was first broached and they talked about reclaiming hundreds of thousands of acres of land, unproductive land, it did not appeal to me at all, but with the land that I have in mind and with a little help from the Government and the State, these men can be put to work and they will make homes for themselves. They are naturally farmers, most of them. I think fully 75 per cent of these 90,000 boys that went from Oklahoma came from the farm originally, and we want them to go back on the farm. Tenantry is on the increase in Oklahoma, and I presume it is elsewhere also, and that is something that we must find a remedy for, and this is one of the things that will help to solve that problem. You anchor a man to a piece of land, make a home owner out of him, and he is a better citizen always, and naturally we ought to give consideration to any movement that has such an object in view.

Now, that is about all I have to say, gentlemen. I thank you very kindly.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any members of the committee desire to ask any questions? Mr. Ferris, do you wish to ask any questions?

Mr. FERRIS. I don't think so.

Mr. BARBOUR. Might I ask one question that occurs to me? Governor, some people have expressed the opinion that we are attempting to put over a great reclamation scheme here and have called it a soldier settlement bill for the purpose of getting it over. Now, none of those men, as I understand it, represent the soldier or speak for the soldier. I understood you to say that you had talked with a good many soldiers; could you give the view of the soldiers on this project? Do they want it? Are they in favor of it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I am frank to say that I think about three or four out of ten of those that came from the farm are interested in this idea. I don't believe the percentage will run over that. I am sorry to say that there are a good many of these boys who went from the farm who are not willing to go back to the farm. I am sorry to say that, but I think there are three or four out of ten who are anxious to go back, but all of them want a piece of land of their own. They are men now, you understand. A year or two has made a wonderful change in them.

Mr. BARBOUR. Have you heard the soldiers express themselves on this particular plan?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I talked with them personally about this idea myself, and I have talked with quite a number of them.

Mr. BARBOUR. Do they favor it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, as I suggested, I think that percentage favor it; I believe that is a fair estimate.

Mr. BARBOUR. About 40 per cent?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You spoke, Governor, of having a law in your State by which you could loan the full value of the farm?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are you able to meet the demand of those that want to take advantage of this opportunity?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should much prefer to answer that by saying that that law is not in effect yet. It will not go into effect until the first of July, but we have it organized and have many more applications in now than our fund will enable us to take care of.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It looks like a very attractive proposition.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is; but you have to have an attractive proposition to meet the demand of the man who has no home and no way of getting a home.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. These soldiers that you spoke of as having left the farm and entered the Army, are they looking for employment in the cities?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir; I am sorry to say there is a large number of them, of those I have investigated myself, who want to stay where the bright lights are.

Mr. BENHAM. In your talks with the soldiers, Governor, would you assume that the possible ownership of a future farm such as is proposed appeals to them or would the 50 cents an hour, as proposed, working for the Government, appeal to them pretty strongly as well?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the percentage that I gave a while ago want a home. Of course, a large number of them want any employment they can get at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON. I assume, Governor, you are familiar with this bill, House bill 487. There is a clause in here—a section, rather—that says that there shall be no transfer or alienation of the property within 10 years without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. What do you think of that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that is a wise provision, a very wise provision. Of course, in our country, where we had so many restrictions placed upon the alienation of Indian land, anything that looks like alienation or restriction is usually viewed with suspicion.

Mr. JOHNSON. Don't you think the soldiers will view this with suspicion and render it very unpopular?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hardly think so, because the man who goes on in good faith will not be looking for an excuse—or at least he ought not to be looking for an excuse—to alienate his land, but that saving clause in there that the Secretary may, after the investigation, grant that permission, I think that is sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you say that a shorter time would be better, say, five years? You know that under the homestead law he gets title in five years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That might be true. I would not venture to say.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am just asking your opinion. I know you have had considerable experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have given that phase of it considerable consideration. Perhaps there should be, but I think there ought to be a limitation somewhere.

Mr. FERRIS. If I may just put in a word there, Governor—it is in evidence here in Gov. Lane's testimony, I think, that he has sent out query sheets to some 250,000 soldiers, and I believe he stated that he had received replies from 52,000. I may not be quite accurate, but that was the substance of it. That would make about 20 per

cent, or about one fifth, of them that had replied, which would indicate, first, that they had shown enough interest to reply, and second, that they had shown enough interest to say that they were in favor of something of this sort. Do you think that would be about your percentage in Oklahoma, or do you think it would be larger?

Mr. ROBERTSON. You say he sent out 250,000?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and about one-fifth of them made response that they would like to engage in something of this sort. Do you think that would be about our percentage in Oklahoma, down home?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, it would be a guess.

Mr. FERRIS. It might be larger, due to the fact that we have a large agricultural State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; we have an agricultural State to start with, but I think perhaps that is reasonable. He ought to know more about it than I, of course. I haven't attempted to keep a close account of these things.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, he didn't send this letter to all of them, from the very nature of things, but he did send 250,000 and from that came 52,000 who said they were interested in it and would like to have this opportunity. I was wondering if you thought that was about the percentage who were interested in our State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think perhaps that would be reasonable.

Mr. FERRIS. We have had considerable trouble, haven't we, Governor, about tenantry in our State?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir; tenantry is growing rapidly. It is one of the menaces and dangers of the Republic. That is the thing that prompted the passage of this home ownership law.

Mr. FERRIS. It is in evidence here—one of the witnesses yesterday testified that his objection to this bill went to the proposition that the Government allowed the soldier to get title to the land. He thought that there ought to be a lease-hold proposition. What is your opinion about that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He was a single taxer. I was a single taxer for 25 years. It is a wonderfully beautiful dream, but when it comes down to a practical working of it, we haven't time nor opportunity, so far as that is concerned—we will never see that day at all. It is not practical.

Mr. FERRIS. There wouldn't be any considerable percentage of the people in our State that would be favorable to any sort of lease hold estate, isn't that true?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is especially true in Oklahoma, where we have had so much Indian land and have had so much school land. We have been compelled to sell our school land in order to put it on the tax roll and make real home owners out of the people. They wouldn't care for such a scheme.

Mr. FERRIS. Have we land in Oklahoma that would be appropriate for a soldier's community?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I mentioned three or four tracts, large tracts, out in Beaver and Cimarron Counties, especially, and in Coal, Atoka, and McCurtain Counties we have large areas of good land. There is a great deal of the very best land in the State that is inherited, dead Indian land, and with the restrictions taken away so that the Government could handle it, that would be a fine thing; but as it is now, you can't reach it.

Mr. FERRIS. And that would enable the soldiers, if projects were opened there—that would enable the soldier that went from Oklahoma to the war, to come back and remain there if he wanted to?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, and lots of them want to do it. And the State of Oklahoma will give the most earnest consideration and hearty cooperation in this scheme.

Mr. FERRIS. What would those Indian lands, like those in McCurtain County, and those out through the northwestern portion—what could those lands be had for, roughly?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, you take the Coal County project and the McCurtain County project, that is some of the very best land in the State, but it is large areas and hasn't been developed, and it is away from the railroad, and it would necessitate the bringing in of highways, which the State is unable to do at this time; yet that land is worth \$10 or \$15 an acre as it lies. But out in Beaver and Cimarron County it may be 25 per cent cheaper.

Mr. FERRIS. Those prices, of course, would not be prohibitive under this plan.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; but those are undeveloped lands.

Mr. MAYS. Governor, in what way and to what extent do you estimate that the State could cooperate with the Government under this law?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a little difficult for me to answer. We are perfectly willing to do all we can. We made an appropriation of some \$250,000, together with a freight refund of \$490,000, making something like \$600,000—a little better than \$600,000 for the home ownership law. That can be increased at each session of the legislature. That can be increased, and that can be taken advantage of. We can use that money for that purpose, and we will go just as far as we can.

Mr. MAYS. Could that money be used to supplement the amount that the Government appropriates?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; if the Government wanted to loan not more than 75 per cent, we would take the 25 per cent out of this home ownership fund. We would be glad to do it, provided, of course, they met the requirements in the way of being men of reputation and integrity and willingness to work, and so forth.

Mr. RAKER. May I ask the Governor one question? If you have already gone into this, I will not bother you.

Governor, what is your theory as to arranging any legislation that may be enacted for the purpose of giving the homestead—I will call it a homestead; you may call it a home, but I like the word "homestead"—that after he has done a certain amount on it, or an amount which would entitle him to a patent, whatever that may be, as to his having the right to sell and dispose of the land.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I presume, of course, provision has been made that if he meets the requirements of the Government after three or four or five or ten years, as the case may be, he can pay out like he did under the homestead law, and have the land for his own, and be free from restriction and inalienability. I think that there ought to be restrictions for at least a reasonable length of time.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; no doubt about that. Now, there should be some arrangement that as long as there is an obligation from the homesteader to the Government, on any kind of a project for reclamation,

drainage, or turning over the land, whereby he is to pay his proportion, by which he may be entitled to a patent. You believe that the Government should be protected by some method—that the Government should not lose?

MR. ROBERTSON. I do. From our experience with our school lands, which we sell on 40 years' time at 5 per cent, we give them the option to sell, just as though there was no restriction on it at all, and we haven't taken advantage of that in any case.

MR. RAKER. But that should be so that the man can alienate his land and still have the Government protect it.

MR. ROBERTSON. The right kind of a man would not want to take advantage of the Government, and the Government ought not to give the wrong sort of man the opportunity to take advantage. There ought to be a restriction on him, as you suggest, but it should not be an unreasonable restriction.

MR. RAKER. Governor, these men having gone into the service and having served, and been designated as men who are prepared and ready and willing to defend this country, do you believe that there should be any board or commission who should now select and determine which one of these men should have a homestead, providing the man is physically capable and able and has the qualifications of a citizen?

MR. ROBERTSON. Yes; I do—just the necessary machinery.

MR. RAKER. Do you think there should be a board to designate which should go or that the soldier should have the option himself—the right of self determination?

MR. ROBERTSON. Yes; I did not understand you. You have got to give the soldier some latitude. You have got to treat him as a free man. He has got to be consulted in the matter.

MR. RAKER. Don't you think it would be resented by the soldier?

MR. ROBERTSON. Yes; he has got to be a free acting man. You can't arbitrarily set aside a piece of land and tell him he can have that or none. That won't do at all.

MR. RAKER. Supposing here are 10 soldiers applying for homesteads. Do you think that any board or commission should be given the power to say, "We will select three of you, and you seven don't look good to us," or "You have been working in the cities, you have studied electricity, and you have been in a law office; you have been in a blacksmith's shop, and you have been in a store, and I guess I won't give you a chance; but these three boys have been on the farm and I will give them an opportunity to file on this homestead, but seven of them have these other occupations, and therefore I will not let you file"—do you think there should be any such restrictions?

MR. ROBERTSON. No, sir; I don't. They would be dissatisfied.

MR. RAKER. You would give them all the same chance?

MR. ROBERTSON. Yes; I think so without doubt.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that my State appreciates the efforts of Secretary Lane and the Interior Department in trying to solve this problem. We appreciate the spirit in which you have taken hold of this proposition. There is no politics in it; it is just a question of trying not merely to develop the agricultural land, but trying to save these boys and make good citizens and home owners out of them; and I say to you that home ownership is the great live question in America to-day. The stability of this Government depends

very largely upon converting these men that are not home owners now, these tenants into home owners, anchoring them down so that they will have an interest in the Government and in our institutions.

Mr. RAKER. Have you given any thought as to the method of locating men on homesteads, whether there should be a particular spot or location in the center where he should live and then farm their land from that center, or have separate individual homes, like you have in Oklahoma and all over the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not given consideration to that thought, I naturally would think, though, that the individual home is the better plan. I am very much in favor of this village plan, like they have in Germany and Europe. I don't think that is a good thing.

Mr. RAKER. Or Italy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I was born and reared on a farm and I still think that the farm should be the great home of our people. And I think that this plan is going to bring splendid results.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; it is going to bring splendid results, but what is your theory as to the method of placing the men on the homestead? Suppose you build your roads; you drain the land—I will put it the other way—you build your dam, get the main ditches in, and get the system into the building up of a modest little home so that it can be added to; have the necessary outlay, a sufficient amount to start in cultivation, and then leaving him a balance to develop and improve as he progresses. Do you believe that would be the better plan, or to give him a complete, improved farm?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we have had a good deal of experience down there putting men on raw land. Of course, our State was opened—every man that went in there with a family took possession of a quarter section, and he had jurisdiction over the whole quarter section, and, of course, he had no help but did the best he could. Now, I am inclined to think that if you go too far in helping these soldiers in the matter of furnishing them all the necessary equipment and tools and money, and give them to understand that you are going to take hold of this thing and make it a success, whether he will or not, I think you are going too far. You must make them dependent upon their own resources and their own initiative, and if they get the idea in their minds that this Government and the State, working in cooperation, is going to make the thing a success, whether or no, you will have trouble. He has got to have some responsibility himself placed on his own shoulders.

Mr. RAKER. Now, I want to make myself plain on that. If there are many projects to clear, the individual through his own initiative, could not reclaim the land, whether it was swamp, desert, or cut-over; if you do the big part, whereby he has a chance to get on his place and commence to cultivate, he can then complete the cultivation and development in a series of a years, and do better than if you had given him a completed farm.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It might be. I wouldn't attempt to say. Of course, these lands that I spoke of—perhaps the cut-over land in McCurtain County, that might present the problem, but these others would not present that problem. I am not prepared to say. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Governor, for your statement.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, we have here Mr. Park, of Georgia; Mr. Morgan, of Oklahoma; Mr. Reed and Gov. Davis, of Idaho. I told Mr. Park that we would try to give him a hearing this morning, and also Mr. Morgan. Are you ready to proceed now, Mr. Park?

MR. PARK. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN. I will state, Mr. Park, that it was the understanding the other day that Members of Congress should be limited to fifteen minutes.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK PARK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA.

MR. PARK. Fifteen minutes is all I want. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as the department has outlined its opinion, I don't think that the people in my State are in favor of it, but as they become acquainted with the object and intent of the bill and the general plan, I think perhaps a majority of our people will favor it. I can't speak with any degree of authority as to how they feel about it.

I am not supposed to lay before this committee any project or plan, but I wish to say that we have organized in this State a landowners association, which will be incorporated by this legislature for the purpose of cooperating with the Secretary of the Interior and his agencies in this matter.

What I wish to outline, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of myself and other Members of Congress who have queries put to them regarding this matter, is the application of this law as it is formulated up to date to the plain common soldier. We have many tenants who have always been tenants, and their children are tenants. Now, these boys were in the Argonne Forest, and some of them in Chateau Thierry, and they naturally would participate; but you take the farmer boy who has absolutely nothing; as I understand it, you propose to lay out a project and give such a boy \$4 a day for 12 months to help improve this general project. If I am incorrect, I want to be corrected, because I want to state the facts to my constituents.

THE CHAIRMAN. There is nothing in the bill about the wages that he is to receive, nor the length of time he is to work.

MR. PARK. Well, Mr. Lane stated \$4 a day in his report.

THE CHAIRMAN. He stated that it would be something like the wages of the neighborhood.

MR. PARK. Yes. Well, they can get that much now. Then he will be enabled to meet this first 5 per cent and perhaps 40 per cent on his mules and plow, tools, and other improvements, by working 12 months on this general project. Am I right in that? In other words, how is the boy to start? How is he to take advantage of what we propose to be a benefit to him? Is it to be a benefit, and, if so, how is it to be a benefit?

Now, a good many who were, as Mr. Raker mentioned, clerks, blacksmiths, and so forth, may want to take advantage—they may want to change their occupation. If so, I would presume that the Secretary would provide that a man who had been in the Navy as an instructor, an overseer, to go by and see how each man is getting along with his project, make a report monthly or weekly to the Sec-

retary as to the progress each individual is making; otherwise, in the course of six months he would be flat; he will move off, and then the Government has the land on its hands.

Now, to go on further, suppose this man through misfortune has a long spell of typhoid fever, or suppose he should die himself and leave it to his wife. He is in debt; his wife is in debt; what provision is made to look after these people at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any suggestions for these contingencies that you speak of?

Mr. PARK. I suggest that if he is doing his best intelligently, that the Government help him till he gets on his feet. Otherwise he had better start out and buy a piece of land himself on his own hook. In other words, we don't want to cripple or throw around him restrictions in such a way that he wouldn't be on a parity with somebody else who had not been a soldier.

And in regard to selling his land, I think that the soldier ought not be encumbered in any way. If he went on one of these projects, a hundred-acre farm, or a fifty-acre farm, and did the best he could for two years, and was afterwards left a sum of money by some of his relatives or had a good opportunity to get a better job, he ought to be allowed to turn it back to the Government, who could, in turn, sell it to somebody else.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean sell it back to the Government?

Mr. PARK. Sell it to the Government and give him pay for what he has done on that project. In other words, he should not be made to lose simply because we restrict him by certain conditions and laws and rules. He is not a free man; he is not a free agent when you do that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is nothing in the bill, Mr. Park, that prohibits that man from transferring his rights to some one else.

Mr. PARK. With the consent of the Secretary?

Mr. SMITH. Well, some one in authority must consent.

Mr. PARK. Well, you had better just simply make it—if it is an automatic ruling, it is all right, but let him do it if he wants to; give him the same power and authority that you would if he was a free man.

Mr. VAILE. I presume that the matter of transfer of the contract to purchase land would be covered by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior in some form.

Mr. PARK. Why should you restrict him more than the ordinary citizen adjoining him is restricted? Here is another man that was not in the Army, who buys himself a farm, an industrious man. He stays there a year and he has an offer of twice as much as it cost him, and he sells out. This man improves his land the same way; he has an offer of twice as much and he can't sell out except by complying with certain restrictions.

Mr. FERRIS. In one instance the Government furnishes the money; in the other instance it does not.

Mr. PARK. No; the Government only loans him the money. The Government don't furnish him anything. This bill don't give him anything. It gives him an opportunity to make a farmer out of himself and make a home, and that is all it does give him.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, Judge, I know you are friendly to the farmer—I know you are friendly to the soldier—

Mr. PARK (interposing). I want to help the soldier, and that is what this bill ought to do altogether. This reclamation project should be out of contemplation except incidentally. You don't want to drain lands for soldiers or irrigate lands for soldiers if you have got land already at a cheaper price that you can give the soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it interrupt you to ask you a question now, or would you rather wait until you finish your statement?

Mr. PARK. Not at all.

Mr. FERRIS. On page 3 of the bill, lines 6 to 10, we find this provision. I think it meets your suggestion:

"The Secretary may also, through agreement with soldiers, make provision for necessary improvements, but the contribution from the fund"—that is, this \$500,000,000 fund—"shall in no single case exceed \$1,200, nor in excess of three-quarters of the cost or value of the improvements."

Now, over on the next page—that is, \$1,200 for permanent improvements—

Mr. PARK (interposing). That means improvements to the land?

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. PARK. Buildings and clearing?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes. Permanent improvements.

Now, on page 5, section 8, we find this:

That the Secretary is also authorized to make short-time loans from the fund, not to exceed \$800 at any one time, to a soldier settler for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, and provision shall be made for the repayment of such loans during a period not to exceed five years with interest on deferred payments at 4 per cent per annum, payable annually.

Now, here we have first the Government giving him land—that is, affording him an opportunity to get land—second, we authorize a loan of \$1,200 to build permanent improvements on the land; third, we authorize a loan of not exceeding \$800 at any one time, but they may loan at another time. For what? For the purpose of getting teams and stock. Now, there are three things that the Government affords him the opportunity to do, because you say it is a loan, and it is, but, Judge Park, isn't it true that a homesteader or a man without means and without title and without money and without security can not borrow \$1,200 from any bank to make a permanent improvement at 4 per cent, and he can't borrow \$800 without security?

Mr. PARK. That is the advantage you are offering the soldier.

Mr. FERRIS. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. PARK. That is about the only advantage that I see, but that is a great advantage.

Mr. FERRIS. That is quite an advantage, isn't it?

Mr. PARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Then if I may interrupt you once more—now I know you are a very great friend of the soldier; I know you desire to see him provided for; I know that is why you are here—

Mr. PARK (interposing). But I don't want to hinder him.

Mr. FERRIS. I know, but, Judge, you have been here a long time, and you are one of the substantial Members of the House, and you know that this bill has got to bear the earmarks of fairness to the Government; otherwise we can't get it through the House and we can't get any relief for the soldier. So there is such a thing as allowing our hearts to go out to the soldier to the extent that we

may load up this bill so heavy that we can't get anything for him; so it is those of us here on the committee that are trying now to steer a middle ground that will maintain at all times a standard of fairness to the soldier and to the Government, and get something that we can get through. I know you appreciate that.

Mr. PARK. Yes; I appreciate that. At the same time I don't want any restrictions placed upon this applicant for one of these farms that will hamper and hinder him afterwards. Give him the same right that an ordinary free agent or free citizen has in disposing of his property if he wants to. Let there be a lien on his property for the money that the Government furnishes him at the time he begins this \$1,200 or \$800, or so much of it as he has not paid back.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, one word right on that point: After the Civil War, Congress provided scrip for the soldiers, which you are familiar with, and that scrip was sold indiscriminately and got into the hands of speculators and scrip peddlers and merchants, until it became bordering on a national scandal. The Land Office, the Interior Department, and members of this committee will tell you that they don't want any more scrip. Now if you allow the soldier to dispose of his property immediately you will find this thing, I think, spring up, that these lands will get into the hands of speculators.

Mr. PARK. He has got nothing to sell immediately. He owns nothing.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, he has been allotted an area of land in which he has an inchoate right, which of course may develop into a patent right. I thought you were asking that he should have his right immediately.

Mr. PARK. No; to sell his improvements.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, even if you do that, Judge, immediately, I think you would find that speculators and men who wanted to make money out of it would get large areas of land and colonize soldiers. For what purpose? For the purpose of holding the land a little while and then buying them out, and the Government would be in the attitude of appropriating \$500,000,000, for that is what this bill is going to cost, and what for? Not to benefit the soldier, but to benefit the speculator who bought the soldier up. We have got to have a care for that.

The CHAIRMAN. You have just five minutes left, Judge.

Mr. PARK. In case the soldier is satisfied and is making a living, and a little money, he wouldn't want to sell.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. PARK. But if the land you give him is not sufficient, or is improper for cultivation, he may want to sell out.

Mr. SMITH. Don't you think it would be well to provide that this transfer should be made only to a soldier? Otherwise you would have civilians, private citizens, getting the benefit which the Government intended to give only to soldiers.

Mr. PARK. Well, I can see this, that at the end of three or four years all of these soldiers that fought against Germany would be located permanently in some kind of business. They will be already engaged in some pursuit that they don't want to abandon—that it would be unprofitable for them to abandon.

Now, getting back to what I think the committee wants, in Georgia they have something like 100,000 acres of land that will

produce the ordinary products of Georgia, and they can make almost anything in Georgia in fruits and provisions, corn—they can raise wheat now, and hogs and cows, and so forth.

This landowners' association controls these bodies of land, different members of the association control different parts of the land, but the whole is under one organization, and there would be no profiteering, I presume, under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. This organization is a State organization?

Mr. PARK. It will be under the control or connected with the State government; yes, as soon as it is incorporated.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of promoting the settlement of soldiers?

Mr. PARK. Not for the purpose of that alone, but then they will have large tracts of land to offer at a given price, from \$6 to \$20 an acre, according to the location and improvements. At the same time the competition will be sufficient to make them come down to bed-rock. In other words, the Government don't want to go in and buy up \$1 an acre land at \$5 an acre or \$10 an acre and sell it to these boys at \$10 an acre when it is only worth \$1 an acre. We have a great deal of land in Georgia that is capable of a high state of cultivation if it was put into a proper state of improvement to begin with, but it costs so much to do that.

Now, I want to say that I am satisfied that the people of Georgia will cooperate in this enterprise, this project that we have now before us—this tremendous project, and will do all they can to further it by State aid, if possible—anyhow, by encouragement in every way they can.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go back to this other individual project. I don't want to take up any more time than you have given me, and if I have got just one minute I will take that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You have just one minute more.

Mr. PARK. I think that the committee and every member of Congress should consider this bill from its application to the soldier alone, not through reclamation projects in south Georgia, that is wet, or western land that is dry, but to give—to have the Interior Department purchase such land as now exists without any reclamation for these soldiers; start them to work now. If you are going to start them at all, and if you don't begin this scheme soon, you can't begin it, because, as I have said, the soldiers will already have occupations that they don't want to leave. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Judge.

Mr. Morgan, do you wish to speak now?

Mr. MORGAN, of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, did I understand you were going to give us 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the understanding the other day, that Members of the House should be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, now, with all due regard to the rights of the committee, I know how these things are, but I have prepared a bill on the subject and I would like to have 30 minutes. I don't want to impose upon you.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. I just introduced it yesterday and I haven't got a copy of it yet. But I think I have got something to say, at least,

to present some new ideas that you have not thought of, and I can't do it in 15 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent—Mr. Morgan used to be a member of this committee, and I ask unanimous consent that he have 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. Inasmuch as Mr. Morgan's bill is not before the committee, it seems to me it would be just as well if he wants to have more time wait until to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection. I would rather wait till to-morrow. Can I come in at 10 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten o'clock tomorrow morning, yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Morgan, do you prefer to have the longer time here instead of 15 minutes, notwithstanding that you will have all the time in the House probably that you want, or do you want to address the committee with the idea of having the committee take up all the points that you wish to have considered?

Mr. MORGAN. If there is no objection, I would like to have an hour before the committee, and I want just as much in the House. I would be very glad to wait till to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. I was in hopes we could about finish this to-day, but, of course, the committee can sit to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. I am perfectly willing to go ahead if you can hear me for 30 minutes now.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, without objection, we will hear you now.

Mr. FERRIS. Inasmuch as Mr. Morgan has expressed the thought that he can be heard to-morrow with better advantage to ourselves, we have the governor of Idaho here and others whom perhaps we are detaining. We might accommodate both Mr. Morgan and them by hearing some of them now.

Mr. MORGAN. It would suit me just as well.

Mr. FERRIS. It would suit you better, wouldn't it?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Dr. Hathorn is here. Gentlemen of the committee, this is Dr. Hathorn, from Memphis, Tenn.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Hathorn. Will you state your name and residence and whom you represent?

STATEMENT OF MR. H. GUY HATHORN, OF MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. HATHORN. My name is H. Guy Hathorn, in business with S. N. Williamson, investment bankers, Memphis Tenn.; residence, Oxford, Lafayette County, Miss.; I retain my citizenship in Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I had no expectation of appearing before this committee. I came to Washington with some members of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, an organization that has been vitally interested in this project from its inception, and to whom the general outlines of the project were explained last year by Dr. Elwood Meade, is it?

The CHAIRMAN. Elwood Meade; yes.

Mr. HATHORN. We were asked to come to Washington, knowing that this matter was up again for consideration, and to do anything

that appeared after we arrived might aid in helping this matter along, because we all believe so strongly in the project in a general way in that territory.

Now, so far as I am personally concerned, having been the chief appraiser for three years for a concern that makes farm mortgage loans, very similar in so far as the appraisal and the percentage of loan value to actual value is concerned to the Federal loan bank plan; of course, having covered pretty thoroughly west Tennessee, west Kentucky, eastern Arkansas, and north Mississippi, in the performance of my duties, I would naturally be in possession of some information that might be of some value to this committee, which, perhaps, you might help me to give by questioning. That, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, is my warrant for appearing before you to-day.

Now, I have been so forcibly impressed with some of the discussions that have gone on here this morning that I am going to ask your permission to do what I have hesitated to do, and that is to read, just as I drafted them, a few little points that I jotted down last night in my room at the hotel; and I want to say, too, that I have not had any opportunity so far to even read in a general and superficial manner the bill that is up for consideration, and so it may be merely a coincidence that my rather unformed and rough views about some of these points should coincide very closely with some of the views already expressed here; or it may be that my experience and observations in the South for a number of years, and my intimate association with the people who are making such splendid progress in the agricultural development of the South, might cause me to form these opinions. May I have your permission to read the rough notes I have made?

Before I do that, there was one thing that seemed to me very reasonable and pertinent, that was brought out to a certain extent in this discussion, and that is that while the matter should be made attractive to those of the soldiers and sailors who would want to avail themselves of this splendid opportunity, it should not be made too easy; that as a matter of fact, the percentage of success in all lines of endeavor is decidedly higher among those who have had a certain degree of struggle, a certain amount of difficulty and obstacles to overcome, than those for whom the path has been made exceedingly smooth.

Now, with reference to the employment of the soldiers in the beginning of the time when they choose to avail themselves of the privilege, my first idea was that there would be a certain amount, a certain percentage of these soldiers, who have no capital whatever; who can not make any initial payment, and that there would be a certain percentage who, because of their own efforts, or because of assistance that might be rendered by fathers or brothers, might be in a position to make the initial payment that would be required by this bill. So there you have got two separate classes to begin with, and with reference to those who have no capital at all, it would seem to me that if some provision was made by which they would be insured steady employment for a period of perhaps two years, at a wage that it seems to me might very justly be a little bit in excess of the wage that is paid for such labor, because of the fact that they risked their lives in the defense of this country—in

other words, that they be paid the actual value of the labor they perform, and in addition to that, a small bonus, if you please, for a period of from one to two years; and if they stick during that entire period, that would certainly be a good warrant for believing they have the stuff that would go on and achieve ultimate success, and that this little excess payment that was put on in recognition and acknowledgment of the fact that they deserve consideration more than the man who had not been in the Army might be set aside, not paid to them, but set aside, to be devoted to this initial payment, and if anything happened that the soldier either elected to or was compelled to abandon the proposition before the end of the stipulated time, then it might be paid to him and let him go.

In that way it seems to me that there would be a greater certainty that these soldiers without capital would have the initial payment at that time that was decided by the provisions of the measure when they should go on a homestead.

There is another point that struck me, that the land should be sold to the soldier in a partially improved state, with necessary buildings on it at the end, say, of two years, and nominal payments for the land and buildings with long time amortized payments, maintaining an adequate insurance on the buildings, and as development goes on, he can complete the improvement and clearing of the land and be employed by the Government for a large part of the year in clearing and improving other land.

Now, I have seen over in Arkansas a sort of semiprivate, or semi-segregated, and yet in a way a community development proposition on the holdings of the Chicago Milling & Lumber Co. It is not far from Blytheville, Ark., and those lands were sold by this lumber company for an initial payment of \$5 an acre, and then a payment of \$5 per annum up to whatever the amount was. The price has been rising gradually since they began that seven or eight years ago, and of course there were restrictions on that, but the point is that a great many men went in there with practically no capital except the initial payment, and in some instances they didn't have that, but were employees of the lumber company and were allowed to work out part of the initial payment.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that logged-over land?

Mr. HATHORN. Yes; logged-over, alluvial lands. This was not far from Blytheville. In many instances these men had not enough money to build a house at all. They had a team, and they actually had tents for the first year and they cleared up—green timber, some of it just some scattered timber left—maybe 10 or 15 acres of the 40 acres they had bought, and were enabled to make on that limited area the first year, perhaps, half a crop of corn or cotton, in the meantime deadening this timber. The next year they would take in a little more land and the timber would be entirely dead, so that, at the end of the second crop, perhaps they would get a full crop on the first limited area, so that in about three or four years' time by exercising great industry, all of their ambition, and all of their resources, those men would have their lands cleared, have cheap houses built on them; they were usually not as good houses as one would like to see, but the best they could do with the financial assistance they could get; and, in many instances, the secretary of that company told me, those men anticipated their final payments by

from one to four years. They usually had from five to seven years to pay the proposition out.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am fairly convinced that there are thousands of young men, who have practically no capital, that were in the Argonne and at Chateau-Thierry, that have the same vim and the same energy and the same determination that these men have that have proceeded on this project over in Arkansas, and that with the limited assistance of the Government—limited, I mean, to the point that you don't make it too easy for these fellows, but give them a chance and make it attractive—that they will make good by a very large majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The idea is to do under this bill just exactly what was done in Arkansas.

Mr. HATHORN. Is that it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HATHORN. I am glad to hear that. I knew that that had been practically worked out along those lines.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you know what rate of interest those men paid?

Mr. HATHORN. Six per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. This is 4 per cent.

Mr. HATHORN. Well, that makes it still more attractive: but I didn't know that the proposition contemplated that the land would be entirely cleared and the stumps removed, only partially cleared, so that the purchaser, the soldier, or the sailor, who went on that land, would be able by his own labor, to coin his own labor, as it were, into dollars and cents in the further perfection of that land. Certainly that would be a far more inexpensive means for the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Did you state what the price of that land was to the settlers?

Mr. HATHORN. I did not, but I will. I will be glad to do it. When they began to sell those lands seven or eight years ago, the price was then around \$15 per acre. In the meantime land values have risen very rapidly in that section, and when I was there a year ago last May making these investigations the prevailing price then—the average price, I might say—was \$35 an acre. Some of the more desirable and more favorably located lands were selling as high as \$45 an acre, but \$35 was about the average.

Mr. WHITE. One more question. How far are those lands from market, from railroad facilities?

Mr. HATHORN. There is a main line of the Frisco that runs through Blytheville—I believe it is the Frisco—one of those lines running from Memphis to St. Louis. Then there is another road running from Paragould, Ark., that splits this tract wide open. They are right near transportation facilities. Very few of them will be more than 4 miles.

Now, here is another thought that has come into my mind in connection with a proposition of that sort, that the soldiers who can make the initial payments, naturally, would buy the first land that was cleared and this would leave the land that was still being cleared. That would give employment to these men who had no capital and had to work out their salvation in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bill, the man who works on the land is the man who is given the preference right.

Mr. HATHORN. Well, to be sure; but the idea I had in mind there was that the man who had the initial payment, as a matter of fact, would be working also, but there would be so many of these men who could not make the initial payment until they had worked out a large part of it, consequently, as a practical proposition, even though the man that had the initial payment had not done much work, but if he is working, why he can make a payment right now and the thing would have a continuous and progressive development of the community a little earlier, it seems to me, than if the sales were deferred until those who had to make their capital had made enough to make the initial payment. That was the thought that was in my mind.

Now, it seems to me very important that these soldiers should acquire an actual equity in the land as soon as possible, and that when he has acquired an equity by whatever payment he has made, that he should be allowed to relinquish his land to the Government not less than two years after the date of purchase, provided—that is, if something happens that it doesn't seem feasible for him to go on with it, or it might be some of these blacksmiths or lawyers or salesmen would get out there and try it a year or two and he would see that he was just wasting his time, that he was physically or temperamentally unfitted for that proposition, and it would seem that it would be a hardship on him if he was not able in some way to dispose of the proposition to the Government and try something else.

That point was brought out awhile ago. In that case, suppose he was allowed at the end of two years to sell to the Government what he had, not at what he paid for it, but get for his equity whatever it might be in proportion to the expert appraised valuation of the land and buildings at the time that he relinquishes, provided that he had liquidated all the indebtedness for live stock and implements.

Mr. FERRIS. You don't want him, Mr. Hathorn, to have the right to either sell or relinquish or acquire title until he reimburses the Government for these expenses?

Mr. HATHORN. I want him, sir, to have the right at any time inside of 10 years to sell to anybody, except that the Government be given preference to take over his holdings; and that point, I believe, is brought out in some further notes I have here.

Mr. FERRIS. Your thought is to allow the Government to take it back with a view of placing another soldier on it?

Mr. HATHORN. Exactly, with this idea, that if there has been an increase in the value of that land itself during this two years, that this soldier to whom it seems it is for his best interest to go somewhere else should be allowed credit, you understand, for that increased valuation.

Mr. FERRIS. You understand there is a provision in here that he shall do that with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. HATHORN. No; I haven't read the bill, as I stated, I haven't had an opportunity to look it over.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; so that if misfortune overtook the soldier settler or if he found that he were temperamentally unfit, as you suggest, the Secretary of the Interior could authorize him to transfer to somebody else and thereby protect his investment.

Mr. HATHORN. Well, I didn't know that, and my experience is that where a thing has to go through so many channels, if a specific program were made by which this dissatisfied, let us say, soldier should want to get out, after a sufficiently guarded appraisal were made, and the bill provides that the Government should take it over at its appraised value and pay him whatever equity he might have, and sell to another soldier or sailor who had not yet availed himself of the privilege—that is the thought, the idea that I had in mind. That is covered by this sentence: The privilege of paying any amount that is still due after five years, because there are a lot of them that do make enough money on these private projects to pay the entire proposition out at the end of five years—or money might come to him by inheritance or otherwise, and he should have the privilege of selling after five years, but the Government to retain the right of buying any farm offered for sale at the appraised value, to be resold to a sailor or soldier who has not already availed himself of the privilege of this act, or to those who already own land and who have made good on it—the adjoining farm may be 40 acres—and who is able to make a payment equal in amount to the amount already collected by the Government. In other words, just take it over. That was the general idea about that part of it.

Mr. FERRIS. You are speaking now of the provisions in section 7, lines 21 to 25 on that question?

Mr. HATHORN. Beg pardon?

Mr. FERRIS. I understand you are speaking about section 7. You are familiar with that?

Mr. HATHORN. I am not. I have never seen it. I have not had an opportunity to even glance at the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, let me just interrupt you a minute then to read what it says here:

“Sec. 7. Patents or deeds to project lands issued within 10 years from the date of contract of sale shall contain the condition that no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease made during that time shall be valid without the approval of the Secretary, and no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary. The Secretary shall make all necessary regulations for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this act.”

Mr. HATHORN. That covers that point. You see I have not read that point. I would not have taken up your time discussing it if I had.

Mr. FERRIS. I thought you had not read it.

Mr. HATHORN. My idea is that 10 years is the limit of any sort of Government control over the land of any who may have paid out their indebtedness. That should be sufficient. In other words, in my judgment, after a rather long experience among poor folks, people that had to dig it out of the ground if they ever accomplished anything, it is my own conviction, gentlemen, if they can't walk alone after they have been assisted and aided and helped and directed by the Government for 10 years, that they will never be able to do more than crawl.

Now, Mr. Chairman. I would a lot rather answer questions than to speak straight from the shoulder, because I think I can really give

you more information that way. This was just purely an after-thought after I had heard the discussion this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no doubt but what a proposition of this kind is a practical proposition—is feasible?

Mr. HATHORN. None whatever, sir. Yes; as was suggested by the gentleman at the other end of the table, that safe and conservative middle ground should be taken, which really insures to the soldier and sailor not only his rights, but that recognition of what is due to him that we all concur in and which at the same time will safeguard the funds of the Government and let this project go through with the minimum of expense to the Government, and in a sensible and practical manner; it can be done. There is no question in my mind but what it can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have covered the matter pretty thoroughly.

Mr. BARBOUR. Might I ask Dr. Hathorn one question?

In these projects in which you have been interested, Doctor, I presume you are familiar with the contracts for the sale of the lands?

Mr. HATHORN. You mean those that I have investigated?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. HATHORN. I was familiar with them in a general way, but I don't just recall specifically all the provisions of the contracts now.

Mr. BARBOUR. Don't they restrict to a certain period of time, or until certain payments have been made, the right to alienate the lands? Isn't that a common provision in contracts of that kind?

Mr. HATHORN. I don't think so, sir, for this reason: Since the inauguration of this particular development scheme, which as a matter of fact, was instituted by the Chicago Milling & Lumber Co., partially to get a certain profit from the land, while they were always reasonable in the prices—and I want to say for them that they never went up that \$5 a year, about what it averages in advance until other lands were selling for that already—that they at the same time recognized the very great value that the development of this land that they were offering for sale would have in the future development of their lands, as yet uncleared. Now then they had—according to my recollection they had no such restriction with reference—and by the way, which I think would be a very wise and necessary restriction in this project—this Government project—they had no such restrictions as provided that all the payments must be made before transfer is made, but transfer could be made after a considerable number of payments—I don't know what number—there weren't any restrictions with reference to that, according to my recollection. Certainly, if there were any restrictions, if the party who was making the purchases, took over these notes and proceeded to pay them when they became due, they had no kick coming.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what it costs to clear that land, Mr. Hathorn?

Mr. HATHORN. I haven't any intimate data on that, but in a general way the sort of land that I speak of, until the recent very great increase in the cost of labor, could be cleared, in the way that they cleared it—partially cleared, you understand—at around \$10 or \$15 an acre. Now, that is a section up there where they have to put out hog-wire fences all around, and if that was cleared just by man

power, rule of thumb, it would cost about \$25 to \$30 per acre, but probably it cost less than that when they cleared it.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of timber was it?

Mr. HATHORN. Different varieties of hardwood, such as was not suitable for lumbering. In many instances there would be a few scattering trees of considerable size, some underbrush, and a good deal of the switch cane that grows down in that country, but there would be no timber of any value that might be utilized for anything, except to have to make up for some by-products that some big company could utilize it for.

Mr. BARBOUR. The reason I asked my question a moment ago was that in California, in contracts for the sale of land on long-time payments, we very often include a provision in the contract for the protection of the vendor, that the vendee shall not have the right to sell the land until a certain amount has been paid, without the written consent of the vendor. That is to protect the vendor against getting some one in there who is not suitable and who is not a good farmer, and who will not properly care for the land—to protect him to that extent. That is very common in our contracts, and that is the reason why I asked that question.

Mr. HATHORN. There may be some such a clause as that in these contracts I speak of, but I don't know if there would be the same necessity, on account of the great and rapid development of this section going on.

Mr. RAKER. Might I ask a question there? And I want to predicate this on the statement that I am trying to develop legislation that will be attractive to the soldier, the homesteader, and still at the same time properly protect the Government and again make no distinction between the soldiers.

Do you believe that a preference be given to those on a project established under the legislation contemplated because he has worked on the project, as against a man who has not worked on the project and is ready and willing and competent and capable to take up a homestead?

Mr. HATHORN. Let us see—will you state that question again? I am not certain that I have got it clear.

Mr. RAKER. Here are two men; one has lived in the city since the war: one goes on a project—any project—and works. They both go to another State to get a homestead under one of the projects. Do you believe there should be any distinction made as to which one should have the homestead, or should the first applicant receive the right, and have the right at his own volition to file upon that homestead?

Mr. HATHORN. The first applicant, in my judgment, provided he comes up to such a standard of requirements as might be set.

Mr. RAKER. That is just the point, exactly. I have heard that discussed here for 10 days. What do you mean by the "standard of requirement"? Can there be any distinction between the men who have been soldiers in this war?

Mr. HATHORN. Well, I don't know. You know, as I stated awhile ago, I haven't even read a draft of the bill.

Mr. RAKER. This is outside of the bill. This is generally speaking, now. Should there be any distinction in legislation against the soldier who desires a homestead?

Mr. HATHORN. I think not, specifically, and yet it seems to me, from my knowledge of human nature and men, and of those qualities that contribute to success that there might be some instances where that should be done.

Mr. RAKER. Well, are you going to allow a governmental board in advance to determine whether a man is competent and qualified and will make a successful farmer or not?

Mr. HATHORN. I wouldn't like to do that.

Mr. RAKER. Well, do you believe that legislation of that kind would be wise?

Mr. HATHORN. Not specifically. Now, there might be some body whose discretion should be used to a certain extent that might have some sort of selective power. Perhaps that might do.

Mr. RAKER. Don't you believe that any legislation that will make a preference, or allow a preference, not only would be but ought to be distasteful to every American soldier?

Mr. HATHORN. Yes, sir; I certainly do.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the gentleman a question in that connection? Suppose you are in charge of a large farm and you are looking for employees on your farm. Would you give the preference right to the man that had been reared on the farm and was a reliable, vigorous, industrious man, or would you go into the city and pick up a clerk from behind the ribbon counter and give him a chance in comparison with the other man?

Mr. HATHORN. My judgment would be formed largely by the qualities, physical and mental, as I could best determine them, as between these two men, without any particular reference to what their former occupation had been; with this exception, gentlemen, that seems to be practical, other things being equal, if it was some particular job, some special work on the farm that I had in mind, that I knew this man who had been raised on the farm was thoroughly familiar with, it is but natural that in human nature, other things being equal, I should choose him, not because he was a farmer and the other fellow was not, but because he had already done that particular work and I would not have to train him; I would not have to take time to train him to do the work.

Mr. RAKER. Now, let us see—here I come along, a callow-faced young man; I have been in a small town and I have been going to school for a year or so; my hands are white and my face has all the red bleached out of it, and I come to you for a job on your farm, general work; now, here comes a boy that has been on a farm, raised on a farm, his hands are horney, and he looks as though he could do the work; now simply because the one is raised on a farm and the other has been going to school, would you take him and turn me down?

Mr. HATHORN. Not for that reason.

Mr. RAKER. What other reason would you have? You just see the two of us. Am I going to be deprived of the right to get the benefit of legislation of this kind and the right to work because my appearance is such that on first glance you might not think I could do the work?

Mr. HATHORN. Now, as I understand your question, you are addressing it to me as an individual with a private proposition, my own farm?

Mr. RAKER. No; I am not.

Mr. HATHORN. Well, let us have that clear.

Mr. RAKER. I am making it general for legislation. Should there be anyone to determine whether a man will make a success on the farm, one of these soldiers, or should the soldier himself be given the right when the land is thrown open for homesteading, to go there and say: "I want this particular tract of land here. I will meet your obligations."

Mr. HATHORN. I thought I already stated before that I thought any of them ought to have the opportunity to try it. That was my intention. I think they ought to.

Mr. RAKER. And you would make no distinction?

Mr. HATHORN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made these selections on these Arkansas lands?

Mr. HATHORN. The man himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The owner of the land had some option about it?

Mr. HATHORN. To be sure he would, but it was the men who bought the land, the men who wanted the land to have homes. The majority of these soldiers who would apply under the provisions of this act, if it is passed, would be men who want to own homes.

Mr. RAKER. One more question in the way of illustration and then I am through. A boy is raised on the farm until he is 10 years of age, and he is sent to school and he graduates from the high school, first from the grammar school and then from the high school, which takes him four years. Then he takes five years at college, and he becomes about 21 or 22 years of age, and he graduates. He was a farmer's son, born on the farm. Now here comes a boy who comes from town, a telegraph operator who was born in the city. Both are capable and competent. Would you give the boy that was raised on the farm with a college education, although he has had no experience in farming, the advantage and the preference right, as against the boy who has been a telegraph operator before in the city?

Mr. HATHORN. As an economic or sentimental proposition?

Mr. RAKER. No, sir; as a business proposition, as between man and man, and American and American who wants to make an honest living and a good farmer.

Mr. HATHORN. I would have to make a choice. I can't take both, perhaps.

Mr. RAKER. No. Now would you make a distinction? Would you let any law be enacted that would make a distinction between those two men, to try and make a good American citizen and a good farmer out of him?

Mr. HATHORN. Absolutely not.

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Let me ask a question: Then, do we understand that you are opposed to this provision in the law which gives the preference right of entry to the men who have been employed on these projects and have shown by that fact that they are interested in making a success of it?

Mr. HATHORN. A preference right in what way?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In the way of employment. It is proposed in the bill here that those who have been employed on the projects

should be given the preference right over the man that had been living in the city.

Mr. HATHORN. Certainly not. I am sorry if I gave that impression. The only thing I recall having said that might give that impression was with reference to those men who might have the initial payments, you understand, and would not have to earn it; that they might be allowed to buy land, that was all; where they start on this side of the tract and start to build, that they might be allowed to buy this land, because they have the initial payment. But they are working just the same.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But it is provided in the bill that those that are employed on the project shall be given the first opportunity. Are you in favor of that?

Mr. HATHORN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, listen, Mr. Hathorn: Do you intend to tell the committee that if a man, a soldier, goes out and works on the project for two years, and here is a boy that is just returned from France, who has gone into the blacksmith shop and worked for two years—he worked there before, but the proprietor and the blacksmith quit, and he hadn't any employment, but he sees out here a farm on one of these projects that he can go and take—do you say now that we should provide in this legislation that this blacksmith boy should not have the same opportunity to get a home on that project as the boy who went and worked on the project, and, in fact, had no other place to work. Would you make a distinction between those two soldiers?

Mr. HATHORN. That is a hard question for me to answer without giving it more thought than I have been able to yet.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I read three or four lines from the bill under consideration? On page 5, lines 3 to 8, I find this language:

The Secretary of the Interior shall make all necessary regulations for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this Act and for safeguarding the interests of the settler and of the United States and is authorized to issue patents or deeds for the public and private lands embraced in farms, tracts, and lots within projects.

Now, let me give you a case here. When the country was opened where I now live in Oklahoma, there were 19,500 tracts available for settlement. There were 250,000 men registered. Now, 250,000 men could not have 19,500 tracts, whether they be doctors, lawyers, merchants, chiefs, rich man, poor man, beggar man, or thief. There was no way to give all of them tracts of land. Now, the Secretary of the Interior did then, as I assume he will do now, work out rules and regulations to determine priorities, so that the men who held the lucky number, for example, or held the proper drawing, under the rules and regulations that were worked out, should have the place, whether he be a banker, a blacksmith, or what-not, and I assume that will be done here. Judge Raker's question seems to be that he is worrying about the priorities of the case.

Well, nobody wants the Secretary of the Interior to say that Mr. Barbour, with the red necktie on, shall have the place, and that the man with the black necktie on shall not have the place. I think it is necessary for them to work out rules and regulations, as this bill provides they may do in order to determine priorities among soldiers. Now, as an example of that, let us take a given project of 10,000 acres. Some tracts will, in the very nature of things, be worth more

than others, but if the butcher gets that or the baker gets that under rules and regulations that are absolutely fair, he will have to abide by it. Isn't that your idea?

Mr. HATHORN. I see the reason for it, certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will you read page 3, line 20, Mr. Ferris?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; that provides that "Preference shall be given to those who have been employed in the development of such projects." Well, clearly the man that creates the project ought to be the man to have the chance to live on it, shouldn't he?

Mr. HATHORN. I think so. I have already answered that question.

Mr. FERRIS. I know you have.

The CHAIRMAN. In other English-speaking countries the selection of the soldiers is largely in the hands of the local committee. They have to make some selection. They have to separate the sheep from the goats—the white sheep from the black sheep, you know.

Mr. JOHNSON. And I am in favor of that. I want to go on record for that.

Mr. HATHORN. They are presumed to be men of discretion and intelligence and judgment. Somebody has got to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Now, we have Gov. Davis, of Idaho, here who will favor us with a statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. D. W. DAVIS, GOVERNOR OF IDAHO.

The CHAIRMAN. You are at present Governor of the State of Idaho?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I came here to add just what little I might to this discussion. I arrived in the city last night and have really made no preparation.

When our legislature met last January the Government was desirous that the State adopt a constructive program in order to furnish employment for returned soldiers, and stimulate business generally. We have gone into that matter whole-heartedly, and we can see marked benefits on the constructive program in our State. I think this is a great question, and a question that we should look at from the standpoint of the Nation and not from the standpoint only of a State. A State, after all, is just one small unit of the country as a whole. Idaho is an especially favored State by the fact that we have the land and we have the water. We can get quick action on development work in our State, so far as water supply is concerned, which is very great. The flow of the Snake River is something like 8,000,000 acre-feet per annum, with something like 1,000,000 acre-feet now in use, with 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 acres of available land ready for irrigation. It is not a matter of speculation with us as to what can be done with land and water; it has been thoroughly demonstrated. We have gone through the pioneering stage of irrigation; our land is as productive, I think, as any in the country, and is in demand. It is well known throughout the United States.

I think a greater per cent of our soldiers than 20 per cent, as has been mentioned, would avail themselves of the opportunity of acquiring

ing a tract of land in our State. They would be eager to acquire it. If 40 per cent of our soldiers should desire land, and they should desire 160 acres—I think that 80 acres is sufficient, but 160 seems to be the unit that most men desire—if 40 per cent of our returned soldiers would ask for 160 acres of land, it would require 1,600,000 acres to supply that demand. So you can see there is a tremendous demand for this land. I have had numerous letters, not only from my own State, but from other States clear to the Atlantic Coast, asking about available land in our State and, gentlemen, it is the most popular thing that this Government could do for the recognition of the soldier.

Now, I think the soldier should have the privilege provided for in this bill and I think this 10-year provision is a good one. I think that will overcome some of the questions that you asked a moment ago—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). Governor, I would like to have you elaborate on that because I am opposed to that clause. I am ordinarily in favor of that bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, the 10-year provision, as I see it—I am basing this on the experience we have had in our State—of course, the people that settled on reclamation projects in Idaho did not settle there under the favorable conditions which the soldiers will settle upon land reclaimed under this bill. They experienced the pioneering stage. They experienced the perils of real hardship in developing their lands. A large part of those people went on the lands poorly equipped financially and otherwise, hoping to build a home. They have, in very large measure, been successful, but during this period of development that has extended over a period now of some ten years they have seen a period during that time that they would have been glad to have sold out at a nominal fee and gotten out of the country, and many a farmer in the United States to-day is wealthy due to the fact that he was unable to get away from the country at some period of its development. We have experienced it through Illinois, Iowa, and clear to the Pacific Coast. I know of men in Iowa that would have traded their land for sufficient means to transport them back to Indiana or some eastern State from which they came, that are to-day wealthy, not due to their own judgment but due to the fact that they were unable to get away.

I think the 10-year period is a good thing for the young man that is coming back from the Army. He comes back and he settles on that land and he develops it; he is going to build a substantial home there; he is rearing his children and they are coming up, and after having an experience on the land of five or six years you couldn't pull him away from that farm. You couldn't take him away. He has learned to appreciate the value of a home, the independence of that home, and I will tell you it is a good provision, I think, and the provision that if he wants to assign the land it must be assigned to the Secretary of the Interior is a splendid provision. It cuts out the speculator. It cuts out these men that would colonize soldiers for the purpose of speculating. It removes that feature of it and it is a good thing.

I would like to see the soldier that feels that he has made a mistake in settling on this land have an opportunity of assigning the land back to the Government. I would like to see the Government

pay him every dollar that he has put into it, make as liberal a settlement as possible and then have the land available for another soldier.

Mr. JOHNSON. And not for civilians who might wish to buy?

Mr. DAVIS. I think that for some time to come the soldiers will take all of the available land, and until there is a scarcity of soldiers, I think that that provision should be maintained. The boys went to France and volunteered in the service of our country and we stayed at home. Thousands upon thousands are here now that would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity that we are trying to give the soldier in this bill, for the purpose of making money. They have been taking advantage of war conditions to make money while the soldier has been over there fighting for his country for \$30 a month and offering his very life in defense of the institutions that the wild-eyed Reds in this country are now trying to tear down. I am not in favor of the man who is in this country and doesn't think enough of it to become an American citizen and fight for the institutions for which our soldiers fought having the privilege that is now proposed to be extended to the soldier under this bill. The soldiers of previous wars have had these privileges. The soldiers of the Mexican War and the Civil War veterans have had this homestead privilege, and I am very proud of the fact that they were offered these privileges, and I hope that this Congress will see that the soldiers who are now returning from France will have every privilege that we can possibly extend to them.

Mr. JOHNSON. Governor, does it bother you for me to interrupt you?

Mr. DAVIS. No; not a bit.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you think that this would apply to the Spanish-American War veterans?

Mr. DAVIS. The Spanish-American War veterans have had a great opportunity to take homesteads throughout the West from the time of the Spanish-American War. However, I am not opposed to the Spanish-American War veterans having some consideration in this bill, if you gentlemen see fit to extend it after going into it, because you are in a position to equalize those matters much better than I would be, because you are making it a daily study.

Mr. RAKER. Governor, did we extend to the soldiers of the Civil War any different rights than we have extended to every other American citizen—

Mr. DAVIS (interposing). I think not.

Mr. RAKER. Just a month—in regard to homesteading, except that we permit him to use the time that he has served in the war as part of his residence on the land, and then after subsequent legislation we allowed him to locate at certain places and dispose of the scrip—well, it was quite a large tract, but outside of that we didn't really provide anything else, did we?

Mr. DAVIS. I think that is the only advantage given the Civil War veterans.

Mr. FERRIS. Governor, there isn't any question but what Congress made an error in the scrip proposition.

Mr. DAVIS. I think so. It opened the doors to speculators.

Mr. FERRIS. Experience has taught us that that was a mistake. Now if you allow the soldier under this bill to begin again to alien-

ate the land immediately after he settles upon it, it almost makes a second mistake.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I am absolutely opposed to that provision. Every land owner, the farmer, the man that farms the land, becomes a first-class citizen. He is a home owner, and we need more home owners in the United States to-day, because he is a satisfied citizen, as a rule; he rears a good, strong, healthy American family, which is another benefit; and when we do these things that we propose by this bill, remember that we are creating a demand for the output from the industrial centers. That is where our trade comes from. Don't think that this is benefiting only one small unit of the United States, or a western State. I am here in the interest of my State, but the benefit will go to the whole Nation. The development and production of the farm makes the demand and market for machinery, clothing, and all sorts of supplies. We can destroy our cities and they may be rebuilt, largely by the support of the rural districts.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the benefits of this act are not confined to the West.

Mr. DAVIS. No, indeed; they are confined to the entire Nation, because I wish I had the statistics here to show you the consumption of our State, a small State from point of population, but it is growing and growing rapidly, and that is very noticeable by the capacity of the railroads through Idaho. I remember some 12 or 14 years ago I made the statement to one of the railroad officials: "Inside of 10 years you will be wanting a double track through here." He laughed at me. They need that double track now and have needed it for the last four or five years. So it is just a unit in the development of the whole country, and I am glad to see Congress look upon this measure, as I think they will, with favor. I don't think that any Congressman on the floor of the House, after making a careful study of this matter of reclamation, can honestly and conscientiously get up and oppose the bill, because it is a part of the Nation's development and it is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the purpose to build one or more projects in each State.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; and on that point I might say, Mr. Chairman, that Idaho is so equipped with possibilities along that line that they could go to work on very short notice. And in regard to giving the man on the project preference, as you spoke about a moment ago, I think that a man goes to work on that project because he is in the market for labor, and I don't think that the man in the blacksmith shop that you referred to a moment ago should suffer—he may be the son of a widow with a large family, and he is working there because he needs the labor, and I don't think there should be any distinction made on that point. I think the blacksmith should have the same opportunity as the fellow that works on the project because he is there; he is in the market for labor, and he is there because labor is there.

Mr. RAKER. Governor, your experience convinces me that you can with much propriety answer this question for the committee. Wherever you take 160 acres of land that is unimproved and uncultivated, whether it be in Idaho or in Pennsylvania, it adds just that much to the national wealth, doesn't it?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And we ought not to be too finicky upon the question of whether or not there is a project in each State, or which State has the best opportunity to provide for our soldiers. Now, isn't that just about the situation?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; I don't think you should hold up the whole proposition because some State representative says: "I must have it in my State or I don't support this bill." I think it is the duty of every representative here—because you are representing the whole Nation—to get in behind the project, whether it might benefit his State or not. I think, however, that your committee that decide upon the projects that are to be developed should make a close study as to what projects should be developed first.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for the Secretary to decide.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. It has been pointed out here by some men that an absolute payment, of, say, \$5,000 to the returned soldier should be made, so that he can make his own selection, buy his own farm any place that he decides to live, and not restrict him to any particular community or say: "Here, we have got a project in the State of Idaho or in the State of Pennsylvania, or anywhere else, come on and get it and settle on it if you want to."

Mr. DAVIS. I would be opposed to that.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. You don't think that is practical?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; I would be opposed to it, because the inexperienced soldier, you give him \$5,000 and the land speculator immediately jumps in and may sell him a gold brick.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Oh, no; place the same restrictions on it, of course.

Mr. DAVIS. You might place some restrictions around it, but I don't think it would work satisfactorily.

Mr. SMITH. In any event, there would be no opportunity for making much of a profit out of the farm if you had to pay the market value of it. On these projects it is assumed that the land will be worth twice as much as it costs because of the cooperation of the Government in building the project and preparing the land for cultivation; and if you eliminate the opportunity for profit by loaning a man the money to buy a farm at the market value it seems to me the Government would be assuming a pretty big risk there which would not apply to these projects, where the cost of reclamation is not nearly as much as the land is actually worth after it is reclaimed.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that any man that went out wearing the uniform of the United States and has good red blood in his veins can go on these projects and remain there for 10 years, and have a piece of land—this would apply especially in the West, to land that I am familiar with—a piece of land that is worth, at the least calculation, \$200 an acre, when patent is available. Now, where can he be assured a better investment than that? The rise in value there is absolutely assured because the productiveness of the farm is not keeping pace with the increase in population. I do not expect to see any permanent set back in land values in the United States, so it will be to his interest to hold that land. And I want to say again that I think the 10-year provision is a splendid one.

Mr. RAKER. Governor, have you thought of this feature that if you don't allow transfers, say within a reasonable time, say, two

years, or three years, or five years—make it 10 years, or even run longer—you have a community of all inexperienced young men without any of the hard-headed, well-experienced, properly seasoned men, like you have in every community, who are sort of stabilizers to it. Have you thought of that feature, that we might overdo this thing, and just bring a lot of young men into the community without any of this experience that every community in this country has had by virtue of the old man that has given 30 or 40 or 50 years to business life and whom the boys all consult and who sort of stabilize them in their ideas?

Mr. DAVIS. Now, the fellow that goes on there and is inexperienced and feels that he has got a hard road to hoe, and feels that he isn't a practical farmer, he is going to assign back to the Government.

Mr. RAKER. No; you don't want to let him assign back.

Mr. DAVIS. He can assign by the consent of the Secretary, can he not?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. DAVIS. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; he can.

Mr. DAVIS. He can assign back with the consent of the Secretary, and he can get off the land.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; he can.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to Mr. Raker? Supposing, Mr. Raker, there are 100,000 soldiers who apply for this land and you have only land enough for 50,000, what are you going to do with the other 50,000? When a vacant entry is available on any of these projects, should not a soldier have the right to take it instead of a civilian?

Mr. RAKER. Well, I will answer the question if the chairman directs me to.

The CHAIRMAN. I will not direct you to.

Mr. RAKER. I did not want to take the governor's time, that is all. I would like to answer it, but I would rather not take the governor's time.

Mr. DAVIS. Go ahead.

Mr. RAKER. I say that when a man has once assumed his right and has gone upon this land and complied with the law, so that he can transfer it, he ought to have the right to transfer it to whoever he pleases.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What about the other 50,000 soldiers that do not get any land?

Mr. RAKER. They ought to provide more projects so that the other 50,000 may have homes also.

Mr. DAVIS. This bill, as I understand it, provides for a loan of \$1,200, does it not?

Mr. FERRIS. \$1,200 for permanent improvements and \$800 for personal property.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a splendid provision, and the man that goes on to make a farm of that place, in all seriousness, is going to get along splendidly with that law, and if this land is cleared, put in shape for him to go right to farming, he is going to have no trouble whatsoever, and you are going to have a wonderfully prosperous farming community out of any project that is so settled.

Mr. FERRIS. Will you let me ask you three or four general questions, to the end that we may not be lost in a maze here?

Now, as to the proposition of the Federal Government doing something for the returning soldier, there is no doubt that that should be done, is there?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FERRIS. And there is no difference of opinion among us about that, is there?

Mr. DAVIS. No; I think not.

Mr. FERRIS. Either in or out of Congress?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, as to the necessity of this Government doing what it has done in the past, giving some recognition to the soldiers, and as to this Government doing what other Governments have done for soldiers, there is no difference of opinion?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, it is true in every State of the Union there are large areas of idle land not being put to any productive use?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And on every hand there are large unproductive areas in every State in the Union. Now, that being true, can there be any doubt that it will be financially beneficial to the Government to have those nonproductive areas made productive?

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely; it will be beneficial all along the line. That is very clear.

Mr. FERRIS. There can't be any doubt about that, can there?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. That every nonproductive acre made a productive acre has benefited the country and the community in which it is located?

Mr. DAVIS. It has added to the wealth and the population and general development of the whole country.

Mr. FERRIS. Then if we have 4,000,000 returning soldiers—more than that—4,500,000 returning soldiers and sailors that must be assimilated into society, nobody would be foolish enough to think that any very large percentage of them will be interested in this proposition. The man who has a good position in a bank doesn't want a homestead. He wants to go back and take his job again, and the man who is an oil expert wants to go back and work as an oil expert; but, on the other hand, there are thousands that have nothing to go back to and nothing in their pockets and nothing in life other than to try to get hold somewhere, and isn't it proper that a Government as wealthy as ours and as powerful as ours, which has made \$11,000,000,000 of loans to the foreign Governments—isn't it proper that this Government do something to stimulate some activity and throw out some ray of hope to these returning soldiers who have nothing?

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely so.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, on those salient facts then we are not in disagreement. Then isn't it the duty of the Government and of Congress, the men in the Houses of Congress, to set themselves to the task of doing something, and isn't that something done in this bill, aside from some minor differences as indicated?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; it is true, and it is right in line with the debt of gratitude that we owe these men and that we can never pay.

Mr. FERRIS. Precisely. Now, it is in evidence here—I don't know whether you have heard it or not—one witness appeared here yesterday who very urgently insisted that this ought to be applicable to the nonsoldier the same as the soldier.

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely not.

Mr. FERRIS. Can any thoughtful man subscribe to such a theory such as that?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And would that be fair to our soldiers to adopt any such thing as that?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it would be absolutely unfair.

Mr. FERRIS. Another witness appeared here who was very earnest in his opposition on the ground that this allowed the soldier finally to acquire title. He wanted him to be a tenant for life, a tenant for a term, or something of that sort, retaining title in the Federal Government. Can any considerable portion of our citizenship subscribe to any such plan as that?

Mr. DAVIS. I would be opposed to that.

Mr. FERRIS. Would that settle the West or the South, or any of the unproductive areas, any such scheme as that?

Mr. DAVIS. It seems to me that would rob us of the very thing we must have in order to build up a good citizenship in the United States.

Mr. FERRIS. Passing from that to one thought that is very prevalent over in the House—I think it is very prevalent on my side of the House—I want to see what your views are about that. There is a line of thought over there among lots of very good Members of the House—they are agitating it very vigorously, some of them—that we ought to make this a loan proposition, a lump-sum loan of \$5,000 or \$6,000—whatever it is to buy a farm and turn it over to the soldier and cut him loose. Now, is that a practical proposition?

Mr. DAVIS. I think not. I think the proposed plan is much better because it creates a spirit of development that brings real development, and it is a constructive program.

Mr. FERRIS. If the Government should, along the line of some of these bills and some of these views here, hold out and publicly announce that they would lend 100 per cent of the value of the farm and let the soldier buy or select a farm wherever he will in the United States, it is true that a great portion of the soldiers would, of course, respond to that, would they not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. But wouldn't it—from the very standpoint of impossibility of performance—wouldn't it fall?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; and then who would reclaim these undeveloped areas in the United States, if we adopt that plan?

Mr. HERSMAN. Did I understand the governor to say that in Oklahoma you had a scheme whereby you loaned farmers—settlers—100 per cent?

Mr. FERRIS. Our legislature made an effort to do that, saying, if I may answer that—and it is done to meet a situation like this—we are trying to reduce tenantry in our State, where the land all belonged to Indians and the white man had to step in there and get hold as best they can as tenants, and it has reached such a stage that it is developing socialism, I. W. W.-ism, and everything else of that

kind down there; and it is the effort of our government and the effort of our legislature to try to meet this situation. I know our State can't carry the load that will be demanded of it. We will carry it as far as we can, and of course I would like to see the Federal Government carry it, if you can; but you can't get a bill through Congress, I don't think, that will authorize the Government to take from all the people and give outright a sum of money like that—five or six or ten thousand dollars—to these 4,000,000 soldiers. The Treasury wouldn't stand it, in the first place, and the people wouldn't indorse it in the second place, and it is not feasible in the third place, and, in the fourth place, the soldier doesn't want a sugar tit rammed into his mouth and be made a child of; all he ought to want is the opportunity to make good.

Mr. Davis, all the soldier wants, coming back from France, is a chance. Every man I have talked with says: "We don't want anything given to us. We want a chance to do something; that is all."

They are coming back after seeing what has been done over in the old countries, and they appreciate more now, I believe, than ever before the value of a home, and that is going to work to our everlasting benefit in this country. There is really too much consideration given to people that are not absolutely loyal to this country and not good citizens to-day and not really the class of people that go to build up good red-blooded American citizenship.

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask this question, Governor: Viewed from the standpoint of a reclamation project, would you consider this is the best economic project that could be arranged for?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I am not in a position to go into the details of this bill. You perhaps will work out a better bill, but the present bill is a good bill. It has splendid features in it.

Mr. BENHAM. I am speaking now only from the reclamation side of it. You asked the question a while ago, who is going to do the reclaiming if we don't provide for it in this bill. Now, from that standpoint alone, is this the best thing to do?

Mr. DAVIS. You take in our State now—may I just answer your question by saying what the conditions are there? The real important thing in our State at the present time is the building of a dam on Snake River, where the Oregon Short Line crosses it, that would impound the run-off of Snake River and make it possible for us to store there two and a half to three million acre-feet of water by the construction of a dam 90 feet high, and not a very long one at that. That makes the water available. Now, I think that the Government is the party to do that work.

Mr. BENHAM. That is not the question at all. I have no doubt about the practicability of reclamation and I am not in the least doubtful on that question, but as to the putting of this thing entirely in the hands of the soldier, is that the most economical from a merely utilitarian standpoint? That was the question raised by a former remark of yours.

Mr. DAVIS. Make it available, you mean, for the soldier?

Mr. BENHAM. Shall the work be confined by the Government to soldiers only?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I don't know that that restriction should be thrown about it.

Mr. BENHAM. And should the work done there be governmentized, or shall we—in short, have you gone into it from the standpoint of the building of improvements and the present amount of work done by our section men on the railroad under Government management? Are we justified in assuming, in short, that that is to be the permanent reclamation system of the Government?

Mr. DAVIS. I think for the present the soldiers should be given preference on this work. The soldier should be given employment. I do think, however, that the work should be done in the shortest possible time, and if soldier labor is not in sufficient quantity at the particular place it should be offered to civilian labor, whatever is available.

If there are no other questions, I want to thank the committee very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Governor, for your statement.

Gentlemen, it is after 12 o'clock, and the committee will stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon at 12.25 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Saturday, June 7, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 7, 1919.

The committee met at 10.15 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. It was understood yesterday that Mr. Morgan should go on this morning for 15 minutes—wasn't it? I believe his time was extended to 30 minutes. The committee will be glad to hear Mr. Morgan now.

STATEMENT OF HON. DICK T. MORGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. RAKER. Is your bill in the file, Mr. Morgan?

Mr. MORGAN. There will be some here. They promised me yesterday they would be here, and my secretary will bring some in in just a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Public Lands, I appreciate very much the courtesy you have extended me, especially in permitting me to talk to you for 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been limiting all members of the House to 15 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; especially when, on account of the large number that desired to be heard, you have been limiting members of Congress to 15 minutes.

I have made an honest effort to prepare a bill which I think has considerable merit. I hope that the committee will allow me to proceed with my statement until most of my time shall be exhausted, in order that I may cover the ground without interruption, although I would be very glad to answer any questions that may be put to me.

I wish to say also, by way of introduction, that I am just like you members of the committee, all of you, without exception, in favor

of doing anything within reason that the National Government can do to recognize the services rendered by our soldiers and seamen. I have no prejudice, I believe, against the Mondell bill—or what might be called Secretary Lane's plan—and yet after somewhat serious study—and I know conscientious study—I have concluded that we can prepare, and Congress can enact, a bill which will accomplish the purpose much better than the plan presented by Secretary Lane. If the Lane proposition shall be brought to vote, and other propositions shall be voted down, I shall, of course, support the Lane measure, and do not appear in opposition to the measure so much as I do for the purpose of giving you my ideas of what I think would be a better way.

The bill which I have introduced, No. 5027 (reintroduced as H. R. 5545), presents a plan to provide home for the soldiers by utilizing a loan plan. It is not a reclamation project, but it creates an organization whereby the soldiers may secure homes through obtaining loans. It creates a Government corporation, called the "Soldiers' and Seamen's Federal Home Founding Corporation." I believe that a corporation can attend to this business much better, more satisfactorily all around, than it can be attended to by a Cabinet officer and a bureau in any of our departments. The corporation is the modern marvel as an instrument for transacting business, and here is a great business proposition, whatever plan you may adopt, and I think it can be done much better through a corporation. So I create a corporation with the Secretary of the Interior as the President of the corporation, and to be controlled and operated and managed by four other persons, constituting with the Secretary of the Interior the board of trustees. These four members are to be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and receive salaries of \$7,500 each annually.

I create a county board in each county, consisting of the postmaster of the county seat town, the agricultural county agent, and one other person to be appointed by the corporation, and that gives the machinery to reach out from the National Capital, where the corporation is located, out into every county and community of the Nation. And I think if Secretary Lane's plan is adopted, that it would be better to have that managed by a corporation than it would be by a Cabinet officer and a bureau. I haven't time, of course, to give all the reasons why I think that would be true, but I think that is a fact.

Now, in preparing this bill I have had three main things in view. First, I wanted to present a plan that would benefit or help the largest number of soldiers. Second, a plan that would be conducted with the least expense to the taxpayers of the Nation. Third, a plan that would confer its benefits upon every State and upon every community alike throughout the entire length and breadth of the Nation.

One of my chief objections to the Lane plan is that so few soldiers will ever receive any benefit from it.

For instance, the Mondell bill is exclusive—that is, it excludes a large number of the soldiers. In the first place, it only provides for farm homesteads. We know that at the present, and for all time to come, 50 and probably 60 per cent of all these soldier boys will reside

in the towns and cities, so that to start out with, you propose a proposition that 60 per cent of the soldiers never can utilize. More than that, it excludes those who are the owners of homes. I don't know what number that would be, but taking the average, that might exclude 25 per cent—probably not that many—of soldiers, because if they own homes they can't get the benefit of it.

Then, it excludes those who are not able to put up 5 per cent of the purchase price to start on. You exclude those—because every farm must have improvements—you exclude those who are not able to pay 25 per cent, I believe it is, of the cost of the improvements, and you exclude those from getting a loan for live stock and equipment—and every farm must have equipment—who are not able to pay 40 per cent of the value of the live stock and equipment; and that would amount to, in my judgment, on an average of about \$1,200 to every soldier. In other words, you exclude those who are not able to put up \$1,200 to start on, and that would exclude a very large number of them.

More than that, there is a provision in there that only "approved applicants" can take advantage of that bill. How many that would exclude, no one can tell.

Another provision which is exclusive in its character, because it says that those who perform labor on these projects shall have a preference right to purchase the land. So, conditionally, you exclude those who don't perform labor on these projects.

This bill proposes to appropriate now \$500,000,000. That, according to the best estimates, would provide homes for about 100,000 men, to buy the land and improve it. Now, that 100,000 men would be only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the 4,000,000 men who have been enlisted and enrolled in our Army and Navy. In other words, it is about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent a soldiers' home project and about $97\frac{1}{2}$ per cent something else. Now, I don't think, members of the committee, that we, as Members of the National Congress, having in our keeping the molding and the fixing of this legislation, ought to pass a bill that, from the very nature and character of it, can benefit only a small percentage of the soldiers. In my bill I have laid the bars clear down. The fact that a man is honorably discharged is the only certificate that he needs to give him the benefit of every single provision in the bill, and that is all that any man ought to be required to have. Whatever we do for the soldiers, we ought to treat them all alike, and not surround our legislation with limitations and restrictions and exclusions that will exclude 90 per cent, probably, of the soldiers.

Now, why does my bill provide that—take them all in it? Because I provide, in the first place, for two kinds of loans—long-time loans, running from 40 to 60 years, and short-time loans, running less than 5 years. I provide a loan of \$4,000—of course, that is arbitrary; it may be too much, it may be too little—\$4,000 on a long-time loan, providing that the loan may be made up to the full value of the homestead purchased; that not requiring a man to pay 5 per cent or 1 per cent or 10 per cent; but he can get a loan to the full value of the home, and that is the only way you can make it equal and fair for every man, every soldier. You must not put a property qualification in which restricts our soldiers from getting the benefit of this bill; and I believe if the Lane bill is passed all those restrictions ought to be stricken out.

Then I provide for a short-time loan, not exceeding five years, to purchase live stock and farm implements, and I authorize this loan to be made up to the full value of that live stock and farm equipment. I know that that is not according to the general principles of the loan business, for a bank expects to get chattels worth two or three times the value of the loan; and yet I believe that we can adopt that kind of a system, and by using other methods really save the Government from any material loss through the failure to pay those loans.

The question of the financing of the corporation or the proposition is, of course, very important, so one of my propositions is that we should enact legislation that will help the soldiers with the least possible expenditure of cash out of the Treasury. Now, that is our duty for the next 10 or 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years, perhaps. We are going to be burdened with taxation for this work.

The plan presented in the Mondell bill and by Mr. Lane requires an absolute cash investment for every home that is secured for these soldiers. He is authorized to purchase the land and to reclaim the land, either by drainage or by irrigation; to improve these lands—buy these lands and improve them and reclaim them and pay all of this money out, every cent of it, in absolute cash, by an appropriation out of the Treasury. Now, that is not good business methods for this Government to pursue. Under my plan I use ordinary business methods in the financing of the proposition. How do I do that? I adopt those principles of business that we adopted largely in the Federal land bank and that are adopted in many countries of the world in financing propositions similar to this. I authorize this corporation to issue long-time bonds to cover the amount of loans made on long-time loans.

I authorize it to issue short-time bonds, not running over five years, in order to secure the funds necessary to make the short-time loans. I have given this corporation under the bill a capital of \$100,000,000. That is not designed to furnish the actual money to carry on this great project for furnishing homes for 4,000,000 men, but it is merely a working, an operating, fund by which they must carry on this business. So a certain percentage will be set aside to operate the short-time loans, a certain percentage to operate the long-time loans, and the corporation issues bonds corresponding to the amount of loans made in each class, and to pay those bonds the corporation has these mortgages.

Now, the question comes—it will be said that there will be a great many losses on these short-time loans as well as upon the long-time loans, because the corporation loans up to the full value, a principle that is not adopted in ordinary loan business. In order to meet that proposition, however, I do this. The long-time bonds are to bear one-half of 1 per cent interest annually less than the loans. The bonds, we will say, bear $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, and they loan this money at 4 per cent interest. That will give one-half of 1 per cent annually margin upon all these loans as a fund to go into what I call a guarantee fund in order to meet the losses that the corporation may have in operating this business in long-time loans.

In the short-time loans, the loans are to be made at 1 per cent annually higher than the bonds bear. If the bonds bear 4 per cent interest,

the loans are made at 5 per cent, giving the corporation a margin of 1 per cent annually.

Just to illustrate what that would amount to, we will say we have a capital of \$100,000,000, and, for illustration, that we have made loans of \$500,000,000 long-time loans and short-time loans of \$200,000,000. Now, here would be the proposition on that kind of a business. The capital, of course, is practically all the time a producing capital. It is loaned out on these propositions, so that the corporation will receive from 3 to 4 per cent interest on that \$100,000,000 of capital, which will be net profit, which would bring, I estimate, \$3,500,000. There will be one-half of 1 per cent interest on the \$500,000,000 loan, which would bring the corporation a net profit of \$2,500,000.

MR. ELSTON. Did you say \$500,000 or \$500,000,000?

MR. MORGAN. On the \$500,000,000. One per cent interest net profit on the \$200,000,000 loan, short-time loans, would bring \$2,000,000 net profit. In other words, on that proposition the corporation would have in the guaranty fund \$4,500,000 annually and have an income from the capital of \$3,500,000 annually, or a net annual income of \$8,000,000.

Now, I couldn't say that that would meet all the losses. We don't know; but it would probably more than meet all the losses if this corporation exercised proper care and watchfulness over these loans, which, of course, the corporation should do. So that this whole proposition—you can take \$100,000,000, and, without another appropriation out of the National Treasury, without another cent of taxation, you can give homes to a million or more of our soldiers. These bonds out on the market and are sold.

Then there comes another question as to the question of interest. In order to get a low rate of interest, and in order to be able to sell these bonds in large quantities, it is necessary for the Government to guarantee these bonds, but it is better for the Government under present and future conditions to loan its credit to carry out this proposition than it is to give the cash, because that cash must come through taxation, every cent of it, but if the Government simply guarantees these bonds, both the principal and interest, it would not require any taxation, except the small amount that is used in the operating fund. Now, that is a wide difference, especially when it might take two, four, five, six, or eight billion dollars to carry out this project; and I hold that even if you adopt Secretary Lane's plan, you ought to change your method of financing. You ought to create a corporation, put a Cabinet officer at the head of it, let these projects be surveyed with the utmost care, and receive estimates as to what it will take to carry them out; then let that corporation issue bonds, under the guaranty of the Government, and finance the proposition that way. You would make an appeal to the public, to the soldiers and their friends to buy these bonds in preference to other classes of securities. That is my idea about the financing of the proposition. Now, in every kind of business, I don't care what it is—banking or mercantile business, whatever it may be—there are always certain losses. How are those losses made up?

The banker don't pay those losses; he simply charges a higher rate of interest in order to get enough from those who are good to make up the losses of those who turn out to be failures and not to pay,

and all we need to do is to utilize that same principle which goes through every kind and character of business. Let the soldiers themselves, and they will be glad to feel that they are cooperating with each other; that they are helping those who are unfortunate; who through sickness or some other unfortunate occurrence are unable to meet their interest payments and their annual payments and may default, and the soldiers will feel when they are paying a little extra interest that it is going out to help those who are unfortunate, those other comrades, and they will do it cheerfully and gladly.

How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. We started at 10.15. You have used 25 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Now just one other point there, and that is the question of extending these benefits—one other point that I have not brought out—under my plan the soldier can buy his home in the town or city or in the country, as he chooses. This is a home-building proposition. If the idea is that we are going to recognize the services that these soldiers rendered, and at the same time make them better citizens by giving them homes, and it is a home-building proposition, then we ought to help build homes in the towns and cities as well as we should in the country. It is not an agricultural proposition; it is a soldier proposition, and therefore we ought to extend these benefits to the 60 per cent, perhaps, of our soldiers who must live in the town or city, to the great army of men who work in our factories and mills and shops and manufacturing establishments, as well as in all of our commercial institutions—extend this to those soldiers and promote home building in our towns and cities, where it is really as much in demand as it is in the country. So that my proposition extends to all, in the town or in the city or in the country.

Now I think there is something in having the benefits of this legislation extend alike—I say extend alike—to every State and to every community in every State. Some of you men who live in States where there are lands to be drained or reclaimed from timber, or irrigated, you may naturally and rightfully say, I think, "Well, this is a good proposition for my State." But if we are appropriating large sums of money out of the Treasury of the United States, it is certainly worth while to see if we can't adjust it so that the benefits of it will go to every State alike. But even in a State—take my own State—we may have a little proposition down there; our governor talked yesterday and suggested that we had land that could be utilized, but that would only be a little area in some particular locality of the State; it wouldn't give any general benefit to all the communities of that State, but under my plan whatever benefits, general indirect benefits, there are in the act would go not only to every State alike but it would go to every single community alike in the country, in the little village, in the larger towns, and in the great cities of this Nation. Everywhere its benefits would reach out and would be within the reach of every one of those brave men who did their duty in that great war.

Now I am ready to answer any questions if you desire to ask them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Morgan, the committee has had no opportunity to examine into your bill. I suppose they will do that in executive session. There are a few questions that I want to ask you.

Does your bill provide for any organization to do the work itself, to put these farms in shape, either as a separate unit, or in a large area?

Mr. MORGAN. There is a provision in there that authorizes the corporation to buy lands and lay them off, either subdivide them to sell as a townsite or to sell as lands, as farms, or to sell as additions to a town or a city. I limit the amount of capital that can be used for that. For instance, they could buy under one section there; I give them authority to buy lands and subdivide them into farms; I don't give them authority to improve and cultivate them, but to subdivide them into farms, and to buy lands adjoining, adjacent to towns or cities, for the purpose of providing homes for these soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. It contains no authority to clear lands?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Or to level or drain lands?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Or to irrigate lands?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The individual would have to do that himself?

Mr. MORGAN. There is another provision in there which I have in the latter part of the bill in regard to public lands, which gives your committee jurisdiction over it. I provide that every soldier, honorably discharged, may make an entry on public lands without the payment of fees and commissions. That is not very much, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Your bill also contemplates assistance to those living in cities for the purpose of securing homes in the cities?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it also contemplate assistance to set them up in business?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not contemplate that? Your bill embraces, then, practically all the soldiers, and you are going to sell bonds for that purpose?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And those bonds are secured by a mortgage on the property, a mortgage for its full value?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And not in accordance with the plan of the farm loan, up to 50 per cent?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or other per cent?

Mr. MORGAN. Unless you make that distinction, I think it is impossible to give the soldier any material advantage over other citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Government is to guarantee these bonds?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; that is the only way you can sell them in large quantities or get them at a low rate of interest, and a low rate of interest, of course, is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. How large a bond issue do you figure will be out at any one time?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I think 2,000,000 soldiers, in the course of the next few years, would take advantage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Two million?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; that is just a rough estimate, you know. Then, if you give them a \$4,000 loan a piece—you can't tell what that will be; a great many loans might be only \$1,000—\$4,000 is the limit I fixed, but I contemplate there will be in time four, or five, or six, or seven, or eight billion dollars of these bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be 4,000 times 2,000,000.

Mr. ELSTON. That would be \$8,000,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN. Four thousand times 2,000,000 would provide for 2,000,000 soldiers—that is, provided they all took a \$4,000 loan—but there are many of these soldiers who would have \$1,000 or \$2,000. Many of them would not want to borrow the full \$4,000.

Mr. RAKER. What was your answer as to how much bond issue would be out at one time if 2,000,000 soldiers took it?

Mr. MORGAN. Two million soldiers, if they had \$4,000 a piece, that would be \$8,000,000,000 in bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is your idea, then, to supply the money so that the soldier may purchase a farm wherever he sees fit?

Mr. MORGAN. Not out of cash out of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. But by the issuance of bonds?

Mr. MORGAN. By issuing bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't restrict him to any Government projects?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't restrict him to any Government projects. I provide that on public lands—that where a soldier makes an entry on any public lands he may secure a short-time loan not exceeding \$1,200, which would be, I think, a very great benefit to the Western States where the public lands are, because many of these soldiers, if they had \$1,200 to put into stock and equipment, could go out on farms there and make a living, but would not be able to do it unless these loans are made to them.

The CHAIRMAN. How many existing farms do you contemplate would be purchased under your act?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is all problematical. My idea is that there would be a very large number. Of course, those farms would be all kinds of sizes. We have, say, 6,000,000 farms now. How many of those would be bought in the country and how many of them would be bought in the city I don't know, but I should think about half and half. That is my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. You think there would be about a million new farms, then?

Mr. MORGAN. My idea is that in every State there are vast millions of acres that are not productive now, that are not cultivated, and much of it is waste land and yet capable of cultivation, in every State in this Union, so that really, as a reclamation act, I believe, gentlemen of this committee, that as a reclamation act this bill of mine will bring into cultivation more new land, it will redeem more waste and unproductive land than the plan presented by the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what do you say as to the severe competition that your plan will bring on with the present farmers?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't think that applies simply to the rich. You take these boys that are farmer boys, if they don't own a farm, they will lease a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. That was one objection urged to the Mondell bill.

Mr. MORGAN. I don't sympathize very much with that idea—that is, I don't think that is the main thing. But here, one-third of our farmers are tenants, or more. Now, this will transform, in a large degree, these men who are tenants into owners. It will not increase the production so much altogether; it will not make competition very much, but it will transform them from farm hands, working by the month, and from tenants, into proprietors of farms. That is what it will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The benefits of your bill are confined to soldiers, are they not?

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely, and their widows and minor orphan children.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many soldiers are tenants on farms?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; I don't know. I suppose they will average just about the same. Say that we have $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of our families on our farms who are tenants, then I presume $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of our boys are the sons of tenants, and a certain per cent of them are the sons of farmers who have farms of their own, but who haven't a farm large enough to divide up with all the boys. There are more young men who are tenants than there are old men, you understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Your bill is so comprehensive and embraces so many, what do you think as to whether or not its provisions will increase the present scarcity of farm labor?

Mr. MORGAN. I think in that respect it will have little effect, because these farm boys—they are farmers anyway; they are working on the farm, and it won't increase the farm labor, nor will it decrease it, because I don't think there are many boys living in the city that are going to the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any provision in your bill against the selling or the alienation of the land?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I provide absolutely against that, although I think I might modify that a little. I provide that this contract, this purchase of the farm home, or the loan on personal property, can not be sold, assigned, transferred, or conveyed. Now, I heard that question discussed yesterday. I thought it might be well to provide that it might be sold to anybody who was a beneficiary under the act, another soldier, but to permit a soldier to sell his contract, to sell this loan, and to sell this land, simply means that you are making this for the benefit of civilians, and it is unjust to the soldier, because it is giving the civilian the opportunity to buy these contracts, which would give them the advantage of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Would a widow of a soldier killed in France be entitled to the benefit of this act?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I provided that the widow of the soldier and their minor children.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in addition to any insurance received under the present law?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any other members of the committee desire to ask any questions?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Morgan, of course we all understand that people in the rural sections are flocking to the cities, and it is hoped we may secure legislation which will attract the city people to the farm, or at least keep the farmer boys on the farm. Under the provisions of your bill, it seems to me, if it were enacted, permitting soldiers to buy homes in cities, that it would have a tendency to attract farmer boys to the cities.

Mr. MORGAN. Then, the farmers will make more money. They will have less competition. I always liked to see the farmer boys go to the town and the city. I think the towns and cities need them. I never did sympathize very much with the idea that you must keep a farmer boy out on the farm; that he must always stay there. I have been on a farm—was raised on a farm.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You were raised on a farm, but you went to the city as soon as you got an opportunity?

Mr. MORGAN. I got to the city before I was 25 years old.

The CHAIRMAN. But the farmers really support the city.

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly. There are many compensations on the farm. I think it is a fine occupation. I would like to see it a little easier for the farmer, and so on, but it is a noble occupation, worthy of the ablest man.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Why do you limit, Mr. Morgan, under the provisions of your bill, loaning people \$4,000 to buy a home or a farm—why do you limit it to 2,000,000? Don't you think there would probably be about 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 soldiers that would take advantage of it?

Mr. MORGAN. There is no limit in the bill. That is sort of a wild guess. I don't know how many of them there would be.

Mr. BENHAM. In providing in your bill that he may get a loan up to the full value of the property, would you make any provision—or does it make any provision—for the fluctuations in value? For instance, to-day we generally believe that prices are higher than they will be in two or three or four or five years from now.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, now, fluctuations—that is one advantage of this long-time loan system. In a long-time loan the fluctuation of the value of the farm cuts no figure. He has 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years to pay for the farm, and the fact that the selling price of the farm is less this year or more this year than it would be the next year or the next cuts no figure, because in due time we know this, gentlemen of the committee, that from the very nature of things the farm lands, as well as the city lands, will continue to grow in value. Our cities will grow, our commerce will grow, and our population will grow; and those things that are inevitable will make every one of these farms—you loan to its full value to-day, and next year is worth more than you made the loan for.

Mr. BENHAM. Is that conclusion warranted by the experience of the past, that there is a constant and steady upward tendency of farm land? Is that justified by the experience of the past 60 years or since the Civil War days?

Mr. MORGAN. I think so.

Mr. BENHAM. And yet everywhere we find farms that are nearly abandoned, comparatively small in value to what they were years and years ago.

Mr. MORGAN. That has been on account of bad farming, as a rule, absolutely bad farming.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think there will be no trouble in selling a bond issue secured by the full value of the property?

Mr. MORGAN. Not if it is guaranteed by the Government, because then it is just as good as a Government bond, and the mere fact that it is for the benefit of the soldiers and their homes would make it attractive to many people.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Morgan, you stated that the Mondell bill was $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent a soldier's bill and $97\frac{1}{2}$ per cent something else. I want to call your attention to the fact that it is a 100 per cent soldiers' bill, although it is true that all soldiers could not be taken care of under the present bill. Isn't that what you mean?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't wish to be severe in my criticism of the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS. You were basing your percentage there on the number that would be taken care of.

Mr. MORGAN. I don't believe that 5 per cent—I said $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent soldiers—but I don't believe that 5 per cent of our soldier boys ever could take advantage of that or ever would. That is my honest conviction.

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, it isn't anything else. There is nobody else can take advantage of it under the present provisions.

Mr. MORGAN. It is a reclamation project. Now, this Government might well, regardless of the soldier, this Government might well undertake to redeem our swamp lands, and I would vote for any reasonable reclamation project, independent of the soldier, for the benefit of the National Government and for the benefit of the civilians generally. I would vote for any reasonable project for the reclamation of these waste lands.

Mr. WHITE. Would you do that at this time, Mr. Morgan?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I would, just in a limited way; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Just one other question—has it been your idea that these bonds should be taxable?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; the bonds are made exempt from taxation, because that is the only way you can get a low rate of interest.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Morgan, you provide that a man can not alienate his land for how long?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't allow him to alienate it at all.

Mr. RAKER. How is that?

Mr. MORGAN. Under the terms of my bill, he is not allowed to alienate it at all, except by payment of the purchase price in full. Now, for instance, a soldier can transfer his land, of course, and if he pays the Government the purchase price, of course he can transfer his land, but I mean I don't believe it is right to let a civilian buy this contract and get the benefits of it.

Mr. RAKER. Then, so long as there was anything due, although he had a deed for his property, or a patent, if there was any lien of any kind against it, you still think it advisable not to allow him to alienate it?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that was my proposition.

Mr. RAKER. Now, right in that line, let me ask you where is this theory coming from and what has possessed a few of our good citizens to reverse the policy of this country for 140 years and say that

we should go back to the Russian system, if I may use that expression, in regard to land tenures? What is the matter?

Mr. MORGAN. You mean that the fact that I restrict the alienation is going back to the Russian system?

Mr. RAKER. It is similar; yes. In other words, other speakers have said that they want the Government to own all the land and become the proprietors—buy up the proprietors of the old land now and allow men to come in, and under your bill, as many others have suggested, they would become tenants of the National Government.

Mr. MORGAN. Not at all.

Mr. RAKER. Of subtenants of some private individual.

Mr. MORGAN. No; I don't think so. They are the owners of the land—the proprietors. They have a deed for it. They can't be put off.

Mr. RAKER. Still, you say he can not sell it.

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no; I say he can sell it, but he must pay the Government the full price when he sells it—or there ought to be some restriction. Now, offhand, I absolutely restricted alienation, but on further reflection I have concluded that he might be allowed to sell to any soldier, because the benefits of the act would still go to soldiers; or you might, instead of requiring him to pay the full value of the land, you might say he might sell after he had paid 25 per cent on the principal, or 50 per cent, or something of that kind.

Mr. RAKER. Well, I was simply getting at what you provided for in the bill. It seems to me that while the country has progressed and become wonderful as it has, by virtue of men being permitted to deal themselves, individually, in their farms and otherwise and borrow money and use idle capital, to now come in on a soldier and say: "We are going to provide you a farm, but we are going to make you tenants and subtenants to some organization or board or something, and we are not going to give you the free will to exercise your own judgment as to when and how you shall dispose of your property"—isn't that about the effect of it?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I don't think so, Mr. Raker. Just for the benefit of the committee I would like to just read a paragraph from two letters that I received. A newspaper correspondent sent a story about my bill to a Texas paper—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Is this in answer to Judge Raker's question?

Mr. RAKER. I am not criticizing anybody's bill; I am just driving at the specific theory, the idea that other gentlemen have presented here besides yourself, as to this inhibition of alienation, and I am trying to find out what has come over our country, if it is general that we should go back to a foreign system of the old countries to make our people tenants of the Government and the Government a landlord, and they be unable to exercise their free will in the disposition of their property. In other words, are we turning back 2,000 years or are we trying to progress?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, my theory of it is that this is a contract, so to speak; that we are advancing through an appropriation of the National Government, through large expenditures from year to year in supervising and controlling this business, and we are doing that for the benefit of the soldier. Now, if the soldier is allowed absolute

freedom to transfer this contract as quick as he enters into it, that contract is supposed to be positively worth——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I never said that. Now, listen——

Mr. MORGAN (interposing). Let me give you my reasons——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I don't want that on me. I have never said, never intimated, never asked a question upon the question of the transferring of the contract. I am going to the question of transfer after the patent has been issued. I am assuming now that the man owns the land; that he has got a patent for it.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I don't remember——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). None of my questions have related to any other time. Now, why should there be any restriction after he becomes the sole owner of the land?

Mr. MORGAN. As I say, he has the legal title to the land, but he has secured that through a Government loan proposition, which is a valuable proposition for the benefit of the soldier, not merely in money. Now, Mr. Raker, if it is a question of money you are going to give the soldier, then you ought to make a direct appropriation, give him \$500 or \$1,000 or \$2,000, every one of them, and turn them out. But if you are coupling with that the idea of getting him a home for the benefit of himself and family, as well as for the benefit of the country——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). But what business is it of the Government's or anybody else to put a restriction upon the soldier different from anybody else, to say, "After you have gotten a patent, I am not going to permit you to sell your land, provided the Government gets its money"?

Mr. MORGAN. My objection to it, just as I said, is that if you do that, if you allow him as quick as he enters into his contract——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I didn't say "contract." I am not talking about contract.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, I will say this: Under my plan he is supposed to have a deed to his property before the Government makes the loan. Now, he is technically the legal owner of the property and has got a patent to it. Under the Lane plan, as I understand it, he don't get a patent until he has complied with the law, but I am not certain about that.

Mr. RAKER. I hope I make myself plain to you, Mr. Morgan, on this. I am assuming that the prior conditions have been provided and complied with, and we have arrived at the point that the man has got a patent to his land, although there are liens upon it. Why restrict the soldier under any legislation to alienate his land, provided the Government gets all that is due it?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as I say, it simply gives the civilian the benefits of this act.

Mr. RAKER. But are we going to enact legislation here that after you give the soldier the benefit of a home and he receives the price for its sale, are you going to then say that the other American citizen can not buy of that soldier and become land owners with the soldier, if he wants to sell and go to some other place?

Mr. MORGAN. I believe, under certain limitations, he ought to be allowed to sell, but I don't believe—it is just like the homestead.

Mr. RAKER. Then why do you put a limitation on the soldier after he becomes a patentee owner of the land? Why do you want to put a string on him? Why do you want to say that he is not capable of exercising his judgment as every other American citizen?

Mr. MORGAN. I think he is.

Mr. RAKER. I am trying to get your theory, Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORGAN. I have tried to give it to you, Mr. Raker.

Mr. BAER. I don't think it would be constitutional.

Mr. RAKER. I don't care about constitutions on this; I am trying to get the theory of the gentlemen now appearing before this committee, to place upon the American soldiers—to say nothing about the other American citizens—to say that we should reverse our policy and make them tenants of the Government, and that they can't alienate their land after they get a patent to it.

Mr. VAILE. If you will allow me a question there— isn't it a fact, Mr. Morgan, that no matter what provisions we make requiring land to be inalienable, even before patent, those provisions will be avoided by private arrangements between parties? That the intending purchaser will send his money to the proper party to receive it, and have him deposit it in the bank in escrow, with a deed to him, and when the patent comes back to the bank, the transaction will be effected by the delivery of that deed, and we can't, as a matter of fact, make lands inalienable, not as a legal, but as a practical proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, I will tell you, in my judgment, the question which Mr. Raker is so deeply interested in—and rightly so—is, as I recall, not a part of the main proposition. I am trying to present the difference between a loan plan and a cash plan in its general ideas. I might, on consideration, agree with you on that point, but just in preparing the bill, you are in a hurry, and you put a certain provision in it, and I might agree with you. But that is a subsidiary question.

Mr. RAKER. I don't know why it is—I don't intend to assume any opinion in asking a question, but you have had lots of experience and, of course, have gone into this subject, and that being the fact I just wondered where you are getting this idea from.

Mr. MORGAN. It was for the benefit of the soldier that I was controlled. I felt that if you give him the right to transfer then you were helping the civilian as well as the soldier in the same degree. So that I considered that it would be a detriment to the soldier. It was on his side that I felt we ought not to allow alienation except under certain restrictions.

Mr. RAKER. Well, I hope the day will never come when we make legislation—I will withdraw that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have had just one hour with Mr. Morgan and I think we have done more for him than we have for any other speaker here. The soldiers are waiting for us to do something.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been lengthened out. Couldn't you conclude now, Judge?

Mr. RAKER. I am through.

Mr. JOHNSON. There are other members here and I think they ought to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Boies is here. I promised him that we would put him on this morning.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of letters here from two men, I believe both soldiers who have heard something about the matter of the Mondell bill and I would like to put them in in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to including the letters? Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. MORGAN. I certainly want to thank the committee for the time that they have given me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Boies, will you state your name and whom you represent?

STATEMENT OF HON. W. D. BOIES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA.

Mr. BOIES. My name is W. D. Boies and I live at Sheldon, Iowa. I represent the 11th Congressional District of that State.

I have been delegated by the Iowa delegation to appear before this committee on the invitation of the committee to give our reasons why we are opposed to the bill that has been introduced in Congress, called the Mondell bill, but which is in fact a bill from the Interior Department of this Government.

Now, we are against the proposition, and I can not conclude in 15 minutes. I think I should have sufficient time to conclude my address. I don't expect every gentleman upon this committee to agree with me by any means but I understand that this committee is organized for the purpose of hearing the views of the several gentlemen who appear before it, and that the record of the case is taken down and printed for the benefit of the Members of Congress, and I have felt that this bill, backed by the Secretary of the Interior, is a huge reclamation scheme and is primarily backed by men who either have land to dispose of, swamp, stump, and arid, or who live in the vicinity of that land.

There are a great many quotations here and I will have to be confined primarily to my manuscript.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the several delegations in Congress having been invited by your chairman, Mr. Sinnott, to address the Committee on the Public Lands, "now holding hearings on soldier land settlement legislation," the Iowa delegation very generously cast upon me the burden of presenting to the committee on views of the delegation concerning the matter and of the related legislation proposed by the Mondell bill now pending before Congress.

Everything in the interest of the American soldier in the World War, which has not yet been brought to a conclusion, is more than popular with the American people, as in justice it should be. I can assure you that the Iowa delegation shares this feeling to the full. Personally, I wish to have the record show that the facts are such that I would go a long way and excuse many things in an endeavor to assist every soldier inducted into the service of this country. My own son enlisted in August, 1917, left his young wife, his boy baby, and his farm operations behind and served his country for a

year and a half; my brother's only son sleeps to-day in a soldier's grave in France; two nephews served in France, one of them just returned, and the other still there. My Official Court reporter's son, a boy whom I loved, was shot to pieces on the battle field, and the homes of scores of friends made desolate by death on account of this terribly barbaric and inexcusable war. I make this statement, which might be immeasurably enlarged upon, in order that there may be no excuse for any small mind, now or in the future, conceiving the idea that I possess a single thought or feeling that does not respond to anything and everything that can or may be in the interest and the welfare of the soldier boy, and in all particulars, so far as I possess the judgment to see—and I am not referring to this immediate vicinity when I say that—

Mr. VAILE (interposing). Present company excepted?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; not conceding the idea that I possess a single thought or feeling that does not respond to anything and everything that can be or may be in the interest of the welfare of the soldier boy in all particulars, so far as I possess the judgment to see.

The Iowa delegation in Congress is opposed to this bill because the Members thereof believe:

1. That, except in a very small proportion, the soldier does not approve it.

2. That it is impracticable.

3. That no considerable number of the whole have funds sufficient to finance that part of the project required to make the scheme anything but a failure in most instances.

4. That the soldier who is possessed of funds sufficient to supply the apparent deficiency remaining when the aid proposed by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been exhausted, will be able to establish himself upon a farm without digging ditches in the swamps of Florida or grubbing stumps on the cut-over-lands of the North, as is proposed by the Secretary of the Interior for the soldier who is without funds, and the sum that he must so earn, in order to meet the Secretary's plan, will require so much time and hard work and unremitting toil as that the boy would about as leave be in a trench in France as in one in the Everglades of Florida or in the "Green Swamp," that the Secretary has referred to in some of his addresses.

5. That the unworkable scheme, the Secretary has suggested, has brought to the surface apparently every man, corporation, partnership, and society in this country, who are owners of swamp, stump, and arid lands, or who are in any wise interested; and, standing without invitation upon the shoulders of the young soldier, are straining their eyes in an effort to ascertain if, perchance, there are a few unincumbered dollars in the Treasury of the United States of America.

The bill introduced in Congress does not disclose the plans, claims, designs, and purposes of the Interior Department of this Government, in case its Secretary is given the power and authority he so earnestly seeks. Hence, we must have recourse to the lectures and communications of the Secretary of the Interior upon this great plan.

Before proceeding further with the use of the name of the Secretary of the Interior or appearing to criticize his plans, I wish to

say that we have full regard for his great ability, his love for humanity, and his high purpose in general. However, the thought presses in upon my mind some times in reading the addresses and communications of the secretary on this subject during the past few months, and his addresses, his communications, and recommendations theretofore delivered on the subject of reclamation of private and State owned swamp, arid, and stump lands, that the honorable secretary has unconsciously, by mistake, picked up the wrong brush, the old used one, in painting the landscape picture for the soldier. We agree with the secretary that, when this Government is able, when the billions upon billions of its obligations, piled mountain high, flowing in and out of the Treasury of the United States, from millions of streams and brooklets and rivulets, having their sources in as many patriotic hearts, have been brought under some reasonable control by the steadfast, sympathetic, loyal, generous, and patient citizens of this country, then the people of the great State of Iowa, and of every other great State of this Union—they are all great States—will commission its several delegations in Congress to appropriate money in all reasonable amounts in aid of all sane reclamation projects, as speedily as may reasonably be accomplished, of lands in the United States fit for farming purposes, should be reclaimed wherein the cost is not discouraging. To attempt such a project on so large a scale at this time, especially so extensive as is being urged by many men, privately interested, is at this time, in the judgment of the gentlemen for whom I am authorized to speak, not permissible.

So long as we are required to feed the world; to finance the up-building of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the isles of the sea; and while engaged in an effort to redeem the world by a cancellation of the shortcomings of men with a glance, a happy smile, or grave, though time-worn, declaration, the men and the women of this country expect their agents to handle their affairs pertaining to their Government in keeping with the times, having regard to the present conditions. And in our attempt to execute this agency we should remember that we are not "the people"; also, that the law of the land, founded on simple justice, requires of the agent good judgment and the highest grade of fidelity. If the Iowa delegation ever votes to put the finances of this Government in a more serious condition than we know them to be in to-day, it will be when some one can show us that both the welfare and the desire of the soldier is knocking at the door of Congress, and the voice of the soldier is heard speaking with his own tongue, and making clear by his own expression what he desires and what he thinks is to his interest. The American soldier is not a mollicoddle; he is the ward of no individual or class of men. Let us have light from some considerable portion of the boys who stood ready to give their lives, if need be, that others might live in decent surroundings.

It might have been wise, so far as I am personally concerned and my attitude better understood, had I earlier in this address called attention to what occurred in my home town some four weeks ago, and which set me to thinking strongly in disfavor of this plan of the Department of the Interior.

We there banqueted that evening more than 40 returned soldiers. Some of the soldiers present had seen service in France, some active

fighting, others who had been in the service a long time in this country—three or four officers, one major, who was in the Spanish-American War and who had just returned from France. These soldiers, in my judgment, were as representative of the usual bodies that might assemble from the country and country towns as one could readily find. At the conclusion of my talk I called attention to this plan of "land for soldiers," desiring sincerely to secure their attitude upon the question; and without the least information as to how they or any of them stood I asked those who favored the plan to stand. Not one stood. Then I requested that those of them who were opposed to the plan stand, and every soldier in the room—forty-odd, including the officers—was on his feet as quickly as though they were obeying the command of an officer. I talked with several of them personally after the banquet was over, and they appeared to have given more thought to the question than I had, and all said they wanted nothing to do with the matter; that if the Government felt that it owed them anything they would be glad to take the cash and go their several ways as free American citizens. They did not desire to be tied for two or three years to an uncertainty. I have talked with many soldier boys since, and I do not recall a single instance when even one of the boys signified a desire for the opportunity to acquire a home after the method proposed by the Secretary of the Interior.

It is most difficult sometimes to criticize another's position or views without appearing to impugn the motives of that other, but I desire to declare most emphatically that such is not my intention, aim, or thought. I believe that Mr. Lane is altogether sincere in what he proposes for the soldier, and that the other gentlemen, who are earnestly working to accomplish the same end, are likewise sincere and are moved in the interest of the soldier. However, there are men, many of them, whose judgment is subject to challenge because of interest one way and another. Interest so frequently biases men's judgment, and the fact is so well understood among men that, by common consent, no man may be allowed to sit in judgment in matters which affect him personally. The judge, however exalted and just, is prohibited by law from sitting in a case in which he is financially interested. This is set forth merely to show that in dealing with men who are personally interested in a project are rightfully subject to the criticism usually adopted by common-sense, every-day men. We do not call them dishonest, we do not think they are, we simply turn their arguments over, inside out, in order to get the real force of what they are driving at. This is the test, in my judgment, that you should apply in your consideration of the arguments appearing before you.

So, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you will acquaint yourselves with the activities of the men who own swamp lands, stump lands, or arid lands, or who live in the vicinities of such lands, also the men whose constituents are thus interested, men who are members of the corporations, companies, and societies, and as such, likewise personally interested, you will be better able to weigh their arguments than you would be if you made this mistake that they were so earnestly behind the Secretary's plan, and without any other interest whatsoever. It will be wise, in my

opinion, to watch for "riders" sought to be attached to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior. Gentlemen, if you do not now understand that there is a supreme effort upon the part of thousands of men in this country, at work day and night, in an effort to foist upon this Government the most colossal reclamation project that the world ever saw, you have neglected the speeches and the literature of eloquent and fetching men. This work is going on in many parts of our land, and with a personal interest, aside from and in addition to their interest in the soldier. And it is expected and talked that the Government shall furnish the money. There is no difference, except in degree, between the South and the North, or the East and the West.

Gentlemen, I have not had the time, I am not possessed of the information nor the ability to present this matter to you as it should be presented. The question is altogether new to me, and I have had but a few hours' time with which to examine the matters as outlined by Mr. Lane, the honorable Secretary of the Interior. I am only acquainted in a general way with the extent of the Government's irrigation projects, nor with its success in reclaiming the public or private lands, yet I have tried to study during the few hours at my disposal, the proposition proposed by the Secretary of the Interior and to get a line, as best I could, concerning the object and aims of the men, corporations, partnerships, and societies that appear to be so earnestly backing the proposition outlined by the Secretary.

A nicely compiled pamphlet of 155 pages, entitled "Proceedings of the Southern Land Congress," held at Savannah, Ga., November 11 and 12, 1918, very recently came under my observation. Printed on the cover the following words appear: "Soldier settlements in the South," and this slogan appears at the top of each page. I recommend this pamphlet to your earnest consideration, and while I would not detract from a single word therein said in favor of the soldier, I invite the scrutiny of this committee in order that you may determine in your own minds whether or not this Southern Land Congress, so called, was held specifically in the interest of the soldier and in his interest alone, or even strictly in keeping with the plans and purposes of the Secretary of the Interior.

It is said on the first page of this book:

Held under the auspices of the Southern Settlement and Development Organization, Southern Pine Association, Georgia Land Owners' Association, Florida Tick Eradication Committee, North Carolina Land Owners' Association, and Savannah Board of Trade, in cooperation with the United States Department of the Interior.

On the next page, under the heading "Executive committee," we find the following, omitting the names of the officers:

Vice president Southern Settlement and Development Organization, Baltimore, Md., chairman.

Vice president Georgia Land Owners' Association, Savannah, Ga., vice chairman.

Secretary-manager Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La.

Chairman Florida Tick Eradication Committee, West Palm Beach, Fla.

President North Carolina Land Owners' Association, Bolton, N. C.

President Savannah Board of Trade, Savannah, Ga.

On the next page, under the heading of "Looking ahead," the following occurs:

It is also desired that the volume serve as the record of the first definite outline of a work which is expected to become the greatest constructive farm-ownership movement ever undertaken by the United States Government.

Under the "Foreword" it is stated:

The Southern Land Congress is in reality a congress representing the "Coastal Plain Region" of the United States.

On page 13, in the address of welcome by the mayor of Savannah, the following language is used:

But I can say in all sincerity that no body of men has ever met in this historic city with a broader conviction or a greater plan for American progress; none have had more patriotic motive; no proposition has had a saner business basis; and none has presented such a well-considered plan for the development of our favored Southland.

On page 15 the governor of Georgia said:

Georgians are intensely interested in the purpose of your organization. While desiring commercial expansion and the increase of our manufacturing industries and the development of all of the resources of our State, we realize that our largest and greatest material advancement must come from the development of those vast areas of uncultivated and poorly tilled lands.

On page 17, the chairman of the Florida tick-eradication committee said, in response to the welcome:

We have come here from many places in the South and we represent many varied operations which are all closely tied up with the land situation, and so we have gathered here to-day to hold counsel with each other, to impart what knowledge we may have, and to learn that which we ought to know, in order that we may further the interests of this great section in any program that may be adopted. * * * Federal and State agencies have cooperated with us to such an extent that there is hardly a county in the whole South that has not a Federal agricultural advisor. * * * The South is very little developed. We can point to many States that are only 5 per cent developed. It is very necessary that we put our best foot forward and hold communion with each other and extend our hands across the various county and State lines and get together and bring out our country as it should be best brought out.

I am sure that we all know how to make an effort, to work in concert, as a unit. We have all made efforts as individuals, and there are a great many men in this audience who represent Government and State agencies who, if they were to think, would recall the great advance that has been made and could recite the numerous instances where we have thrown aside all these things that held us back in the past.

On page 20 it is recorded that the governor of North Carolina gave utterance to the following:

When the Germans started their great offensive last March Lloyd-George said: "The race is between Hindenburg and Wilson." To-day the ends of the earth know, and knowing rejoice that Woodrow Wilson won that great Olympic.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am just one member of this committee, and I do object to the gentleman reading a manuscript which could be read by every member of this committee and save a great deal of time and a great deal of money for the people, and we can do something for the soldiers quicker by adopting this method than we can by having the gentleman read his paper. I observe from his reading that it is in such shape—from his manuscript I should say that it is in such shape that all of us could read it and the gentleman could make an address without taking up all this time. I object.

Mr. VAILE. I would like to have an opportunity to interrogate Mr. Boies before he gets away.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I want to ask two or three questions myself, but he is reading a manuscript here and we can all read it when it is incorporated in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman has been invited before the committee and has been designated by his State to represent that State, and I don't see how we can control whether he makes an extemporaneous speech or reads a prepared speech.

Mr. BOIES. I want to say this: That I am very proud to have been selected as a member of the Judiciary Committee. We have been holding meetings for the last three or four days, and we have sat quietly there and listened to one man for as much as three hours, and I would like to proceed with this. There are some things that I believe will be interesting—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). I am in favor of Mr. Boies—of your paper going into the record, but I thought you could help us more by arguing your question and let your address go into the record. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BOIES. But I believe that these gentlemen in the South are hooked up to the plan of the Secretary of the Interior—and the men from the North and West, and that is what I want the Members of Congress to know.

Mr. JOHNSON. I notice all through your address that you reflect upon the South.

Mr. BOIES. No; I don't mean any reflection.

Mr. JOHNSON. And I take exception to it, and I want the record to show it.

Mr. BOIES. I am putting in their own language. I don't blame the South for getting all that's coming to them—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). Just pardon me one suggestion. You will observe that those men have come from the North, most of them, and have settled in the South. Some of them are from your own beloved State of Iowa.

Mr. BOIES. That last sentence that I read was put in there as a matter of humor. It pleased me.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, I don't want to interrupt you, but it was understood the other day that Members of Congress should be limited to 15 minutes, but we have extended the time of Mr. Morgan to 30 minutes. I don't want to curtail you. How long would it take you to finish?

Mr. BOIES. He was on his feet for about an hour and 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opening statement.

Mr. VAILE. He was being interrogated about half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. How long would it take you to complete your statement?

Mr. BOIES. I am about half through.

Mr. WHITE. He is presenting this paper, Mr. Chairman, very consecutively, much more clearly than it could otherwise be done.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no idea of curtailing his time, but we would like to have some idea how long it will be, so we can determine how long we shall sit.

Mr. BOIES. It is my judgment—and I am entitled to my own judgment—I don't expect it is going to fit the judgment of every man upon this committee, and I don't know that it will fit the judgment

of any gentleman upon this committee, but I think that Congress should know, and I think that I ought to have a chance to state orally to this committee, the history that the Secretary of the Interior has made, aided by men who have axes to grind, if you please, with reference to the worthless land in the present situation in this country.

Mr. MAYS. Do you believe that the Secretary has an ax to grind?

Mr. BOIES. No ax to grind financially; no ax to grind, except that he is in love with his own proposition and wants to see it carried through, and he wants help from whatever source he can get it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Inasmuch as the committee seems disposed to allow you to go on over my objection—which is right, for the majority to control—I ask you this: Are you in favor of doing anything for the soldier?

Mr. BOIES. Not under this plan at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just one other question. What is your plan?

Mr. BOIES. My plan is that if anything is done for the soldier to-day, we ought to do what he desires, and that is for this Government to hand him as much money as the Government thinks it can afford to in view of his services, and let him go as an independent, free, American citizen.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much do you think the Government should hand him? You represent a congressional district, I see. How much do you think the Government should let him have?

Mr. BOIES. I think the Government should let him have from \$25 to \$50 per month for the months that he was detained in the service by the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is your idea now, is it?

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. That would amount to at least an average of 12 months for 4,000,000 men.

Mr. BOIES. It would not amount to more than six months for 4,000,000 men.

Mr. ELSTON. Don't you believe that all of that money would be in the hands of a very small number within two or three months and the soldier would be in just as bad a fix as he was when he was turned loose?

Mr. BOIES. Not any more so than the pension that goes into the hands of every soldier who ever served in any war in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Pensions are paid by the month to meet his current needs, where under your plan it would go to him all in one lump.

Mr. ELSTON. That would amount to \$2,400,000,000.

Mr. BOIES. The Government can very easily make this payable that way, and I would approve of that, and thank you for the suggestion, Mr. Smith.

Mr. JOHNSON. Judge, you would object to any reconstruction measure of this kind?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON. You would be opposed to giving the soldier an opportunity to acquire a home for his family and himself?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; because there isn't, in my judgment, 3 per cent of the soldiers that desire it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, what is the extent of your information about the soldiers wanting to acquire homes?

Mr. BOIES. It is simply what I read to you.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me suggest that the judge may be permitted to first complete his remarks.

Mr. BOIES. I have talked with soldiers since, and have received some letters. I attach one letter here from a soldier which I received yesterday that I never heard of before.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right; I will suspend.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't want to break you off.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is perfectly all right. I just wanted to elicit that information.

Mr. BOIES. Again, on page 21, it is reported that the governor said [reading]:

Some time ago I was down in Currituck, the extreme northeastern county of the State, and I said to one of the natives, "What do you people raise down here?" He replied, "Ducks and Democrats, hell and sweet potatoes." Mr. Secretary, I commend to your consideration a soil that contributes to the world four of its greatest staples.

The governor having confirmed—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). I object to all of that, Mr. Chairman. That is the rankest kind of partisanship.

Mr. BOIES. Now that was a little humor there. I thought this would probably be dry to some of the members, and I put that in as a reflection of that humor.

The governor having confirmed the truth of the "native's reply," I trust the southern gentlemen will not take offense if the friendly advice is extended to them to take off their coats and raise more ducks and less Democrats, more sweet potatoes and less hell.

On page 27 of the document it is of record that Mr. Elwood Mead, consulting engineer United States Reclamation Service, said:

The main responsibility for carrying out rural reconstruction rests with the Federal Government. It is a Nation's task and most of the money must come from the Federal Treasury. * * * Most of this land needs reclamation; logged-off lands need to be cleared; the flat lands need to be drained, and the arid lands irrigated. * * * It would be a waste of time and money to create separate State engineering organizations, when one central organization is already equipped for this task. The Federal Government can also give a unity to plans, can exercise an expert supervision over local organization everywhere, and thus avert experiments that would certainly result in failure and put an end to wasteful and inefficient local efforts if such should unfortunately appear.

Again, on page 29, this same gentleman is reported to have said:

It takes hard work, economy, and self-denial to improve and pay for a farm. The man of the family on one of these farms will find it easier to work hard and live simply if all the people around him are also working hard and living simply, but if a single settler is located in a community of well-to-do easy-going families, with farms paid for, the contrast with their conditions is discouraging, and the settler and his family will fall into easy ways of living and very likely fail. * * * No settler without money should be accepted. The average soldier is not a superman. The task of improving and paying for a farm without any capital is a task which requires superior qualifications. Every settler needs also a little reserve money for accidents and misfortunes. He needs a part of the investment on which he does not have to pay interest. Furthermore, it will be unsafe for the Government to intrust valuable property to men who have no money risk and who could abandon it without losing anything. Many of these soldiers will be restless, made so by their war experiences. To them distant hills will look green. In their own interest they need to be anchored, to have some stabilizing influence, and the most potent is to have some money invested that they will lose if they abandon their undertaking.

Turn to page 32 and read further in connection with what the gentleman has to say:

On some of the South Atlantic areas I have visited the settler can make his own improvements if he is given some help. Say to him it will take two or three years to clear this land and bring the soil into condition to produce crops; no payments will be required until this work is finished. You will be paid for every acre properly cleared, for every rod of fence built, and for the fertilizing and manuring of the worn-out lands.

Again he says:

When settlement begins there needs to be created cooperative organization for buying and selling and expert assistance and direction in the building of houses and other improvements, and then when the settlers are on the land there will be needed a superintendent, who will be the adviser of the Government and a source of encouragement and admonition to the settlers. He will go among the settlers advising them about farming methods, helping to save them from the consequences of inexperience and weakness. The Government will have to depend on him for advice as to who shall be aided and those upon whom aid will be thrown away, because they lack the qualities essential to success. In many ways the superintendent of the settlement is the most important officer connected with this movement. * * * In every settlement the first three years will be critical, and this is the period where advice, encouragement, and direction will mean much in the creation of agriculture and a rural life that the Nation needs, and which nothing but community organization and the mobilizing of the expert knowledge of the country in constructive action will create.

The general manager New Orleans Association of Commerce says:

The project for the creation of complete farm homes to be sold to returning soldiers and sailors, which Secretary Lane is now developing, is a stepping stone to a national policy looking to a far-reaching improvement in the conditions under which farms are operated and farm folk live.

The importance of this movement is so great, not only to the several communities directly affected, but to the national welfare, that the New Orleans Association of Commerce has sought the best engineering service obtainable in order to place itself in the best possible position to be of assistance to Secretary Lane, not only in the formulation of his immediate project, but in the development of a constructive national policy for the betterment of farming conditions and the attraction of people back to the land. * * * The Government should acquire these waste regions, give them comprehensive treatment and development, and sell finished farm areas at value on convenient terms to people who have been trained to make such lands produce them a good living. * * * The Government, operating on a large scale, would save money, and could produce finished units at less cost than is the cost with private enterprise, which must invariably combat conditions which would not confront the Government at all. * * * In Louisiana we have 9,600,000 acres of humus-covered alluvial marsh lands—much of it treeless—ready and waiting such treatment.

On page 104 is shown a telegram to this Southern Land Congress, which reads in part as follows:

You have vast bodies of unused unreclaimed lands as rich as any in the world, a climate and rainfall which can not be improved upon for the growing of crops, and these things our country is beginning to appreciate. I trust you will be moved to take practical steps by which the Government can quickly cooperate with the people of the South, as we hope it will cooperate with the people of the North and West, in using this opportunity for adding to the area of our productive lands.

The Director of the United States Reclamation Service, announcing the contents of the said telegram from Secretary Lane and the fact that he could not be present as was expected, says (see p. 106):

And just before I left Washington the Secretary gave me instructions, which I have transmitted to the men in the field, to prepare the largest program for

which we are ready, which should be laid before Congress for their consideration, for the solving of this problem, which is coming much more rapidly than at first expected. We shall do the best we can. The program for the present is in the West. It is my desire to prepare at the earliest possible time a similar program for the Eastern States. * * * (See p. 107.) I have not the authority to say definitely that the Government will enter into any such program. That will depend on the action of Congress. I do know, though, that the sentiment in Congress for this plan is very strong. Our preliminary preparations have practically no opposition from the committees of either House. * * * (See p. 108.) We have already sent in, approved by the President, an estimate of appropriation for a million dollars to carry on the investigations of swamp and cut-over lands. * * * We have found the utmost cooperation throughout the South; there have been some skeptics, of course. It is a vast program, still it is possible. Of course, it could not be thought possible that the Government was going to undertake all the reclamation projects in the Southern States. There are some fifty or sixty million acres that might be reclaimed. If we undertook it all at once, it would justify the arguments made against it.

On page 111 we find the following from the director of advertising and trade extension, Southern Pine Association:

I want to say I enjoyed the talkfest of the governors, and if I am ever called on to write advertising copy for a campaign to sell the South I will know some wonderful things to say about it. * * * But this is more or less a big business proposition, and comes right down to the straight-out business of exchanging cut-over lands for real honest-to-goodness spending money.

He should have shot the unearned increment in his mind and added from the pockets of "Uncle Sam."

The president of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce, read by the general secretary of Georgia Chamber of Commerce, said, as shown on page 143:

Not knowing just what plans Secretary Lane has to propose relative to the settling of our returning soldiers on our unoccupied lands, that phase of the question must be left to him. We have, however, a larger problem and opportunity, for if every soldier landward inclined was to settle in the Southeast only a fraction of our now unused land would be put to use.

Perhaps I should make a sort of apology to the gentlemen of the South for appearing to single them out from among some of their brothers of the North and West, who are as fully interested in the great scheme of looking beyond their interest in the soldier. My excuse is that these southern gentlemen, from whom I have quoted, have covenanted openly, frankness being one of the virtues of the man from the Southland. The northerner is more secretive, but I will guarantee the southerner that the interested northerner or westerner has been just as busy in connection with this matter as the man from the South. There is not much difference between the men from the two sections, excepting perhaps the man from the Southland is a little more effulgent, not due in any measure to heredity but to climatic conditions—it may possibly be due in some measure to the habit of the statesmen from the South in their usual attempt to laugh the argument of the northerner out of court.

I would not pass without mentioning the fact that there are many, many good things related in this book to which I have not called attention. I have simply drafted these quotations to show the trend of the minds of the gentlemen who spoke at that great meeting in the direction of the most colossal reclamation scheme ever dreamed of by man.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I beg your pardon for consuming so much time with this subject, and the only excuse

I have to offer is based upon my belief that this is the most important question, from a financial point of view, affecting the people of this Government that will be brought before Congress at this session. And the great danger, as I see it, is that the Government is going to be drawn into a business so large and so expensive as to seriously injure the credit of this Government when the money necessarily required to be expended is piled upon the top of the financial obligations of the country to-day. So that if anything is considered or carried out under the plans of the Secretary of the Interior, those considerations and plans should be confined strictly in the interest of the soldiers, and those only, who would like to become the owner of a 10, 20, or 40 acre farm encumbered as proposed by the Secretary of the Interior. In case the project is confined absolutely to the welfare of the soldier, if it may be said to be in his interest, an army of new men will be marching out of the office of the Secretary of the Interior to take up new duties without number. And should the Government be drawn into the larger scheme, that army of men would extend from Washington to Key West, from there to New Orleans, across the continent to southern California, north to the Canadian line, east to the topmost point of Maine, and back again to Washington. Up and across the States again, checker-boarding the waste lands of this country.

These men who are interesting themselves in this project are anxious that the Government "do it," and do it hurriedly and in a big way. We all know from recent experiences that when this Government moves rapidly and in a big way that waste and extravagance marks the path, especially in connection with all Government contracts with a "plus" attachment. Please do not get the idea for a moment that I would advocate a tight-fisted, stingy policy for this Government. It ought to be liberal in all good works, when the times warrant it, but to-day the tight affairs of this country are demanding of its agents in Congress all proper economy, and especially until such time as the present great burden of debt may be at least eased from the weary shoulders of those who are required to pay, pay, pay. This demand is not only urgent on the part of the people who pay directly into the Treasury of the United States, but from all the laboring classes in this country, most of whom are having hard work to make both ends meet, though receiving the highest wages ever paid mortal man. I beseech the patience of this committee for just a few moments longer to discuss the feasibility of the working plans of the Secretary of the Interior by referring to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of the sundry civil bill for 1920, third session Sixty-fifth Congress, that a line may be had on some of the plans of the Secretary of the Interior. I will not trespass upon your time to call attention to all that Mr. Lane said before that committee, but this address would be sorrowfully incomplete without some reference thereto, and I invite an examination of the hearings before such committee, especially as recorded on pages 841 to and including 862. You will there find that it was proposed by a bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, to make an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the reclamation of waste lands. The bill now pending before Congress, which contemplates launching the power and authority into the hands of the Secretary

of the Interior, has increased the amount to \$500,000,000. In the discretion of the Secretary, churches, community centers, and schools shall be dedicated; also other public purposes, including town sites inaugurated, developed, and sold. Mr. Lane stated on page 842, sundry civil bill hearings:

We want now \$100,000,000. That figure is used not because it is the proper figure, in my judgment, because I think it is far too little to meet the needs of the situation, but we want a sufficient amount of money divided up among the projects that are feasible in each State, in order to start one of those projects wherever possible; \$100,000,000 would cover practically all of the States in the Union if we put \$2,000,000 into each State, but there may be some States in which there will not be any possibility of a project such as we contemplate.

I think, gentlemen, that we are going to have need of a great deal more money. I do not know whether you want to put this into your record or not, but the reports that I get from the Department of Labor and the interviews that I have had with business men and with workmen indicate to me that the labor market is in almost a state of collapse.

The time of which the Secretary speaks with reference to a collapse of the labor market was last year. Since then 50 per cent or more of the soldiers have been returned from across the water and approximately 70 per cent of all the soldiers on this side have been discharged, and now it does not appear that the labor market has "collapsed."

I heard Congressman Fordney on the floor of the House of Representatives a few days ago make the statement that it was impossible to secure an order for an automobile within three months, due to the shortage of labor. I read within the last few days in a report from the Department of Agriculture that there was now a shortage in labor in certain agricultural lines, especially in the South.

The Sioux City Daily Journal of June 1, 1919, published in a city of about 80,000 inhabitants, contains the following:

Fifty calls for men to serve in various capacities were filed before 9 o'clock yesterday morning in the Federal employment Bureau. Many additional calls for help were received later in the day. The expected unusual demand of spring and early summer labor requirements has manifest itself with surprising strength in Sioux City territory, according to J. W. Holmes, director of the agency.

Among the early calls yesterday were applications for 10 brickyard men, man on coal wagon at \$5 a day, 5 men in wholesale store warehouses, 5 carpenters for elevator construction, 3 laborers, 2 cooks, 1 farm hand at \$75 a month, and 10 men to unload lumber. Not a single person was available to fill these vacancies, offering liberal compensation.

It is easily seen that the strongest argument put forth by the Secretary of the Interior in favor of the proposition is that of furnishing Government labor for the unemployed, in order that the labor market might not collapse. If there was any danger at the time the Secretary spoke, it is very apparent that the danger is in no wise imminent today.

Again, on page 843, sundry civil appropriation bill hearing, the Secretary said:

This project which I presented to you gentlemen of Congress and to the President last May was intended originally to take care of the returning soldier, so that he would not be a burden upon the labor market. It was not expected that we would take care of every soldier and of every man thrown out of work; that is, I had no hope that such an amount of money could be obtained from Congress as would lead to that result; but I am inclined to think that before this summer is over you are going to have a demand made upon you

which you will have difficulty conscientiously in resisting for ten times the amount of money that is suggested here. * * With this hundred million dollars we can, of course, take care of comparatively few of the soldiers that return. I have here a pamphlet that I am going to send to you to-day, giving letters from a number of the boys who are over in France or who have returned or who are in cantonments, just such letters as have been sent to me from hundreds of other boys who have seen some mention of this proposition in the newspapers. I think you will be surprised in looking over them. I was surprised to find a very considerable number of letters from men who come from the cities where the greatest congestion is, men who have gotten a taste for outdoor life and want to continue it. There is no use in putting such men on a farm, on a piece of prairie land out in the mountains of California, or the plains of Wyoming, or down in southern Colorado and saying, "Here is 160 or 320 acres of land; go to it and make a living." They have nothing to live on; they do not know how to farm; they do not know what crops will grow there; they have nothing with which to build even a shack, nothing with which to buy tools, so that it would be simply turning a fellow loose on the desert to ask him to take up any of our public lands. We have about 230,000,000 acres of public lands, most of which is valueless. The larger part of it is at the top of the Rocky Mountains.

You will notice that it is said these soldiers whom the Secretary proposes to provide for have no money with which to help themselves, "with which to build even a shack." Yet the bill before Congress proposes that these soldiers shall buy live stock and equipment, but that the Government will not lend them to exceed 60 per cent of the cost. Is it not well to stop long enough to inquire from whom they are going to borrow the 40 per cent? The proposition is only to loan soldier settlers not to exceed \$800 for the purchase of the necessary live stock and equipment. Is there anyone familiar at all with the price of live stock and equipment sufficient to carry on a farm of any size who does not know that it would cost two or three times \$800 to purchase the necessary live stock and equipment to operate a small farm successfully.

The bill before Congress also provides that the Secretary may also, through agreement with the soldier settler, make provision for necessary improvements, but the contribution from the fund shall in no single case exceed \$1,200 or in excess of three-quarters of the cost or value of the improvements. Who will tell us where the soldier settler, "who has nothing to live on," has "nothing with which to build even a shack," is going to get the other \$400? If he could procure the extra \$400 from some unnamed source, and after he had borrowed \$1,200 from the Government he would have \$1,600 with which to make the necessary improvements upon his farm—to build his house, to have a bath therein, as suggested by the Secretary. A house with a heating plant, made necessary by the appearance of a bathtub. To build a granary, to build a hen house, to build the hog houseings, to construct a water and heating system, because a bathtub without a water system would be a worthless piece of furniture, as the good wife of this young soldier settler would not be content with heating the bath water in a tea kettle. This is mentioned because the plan proposed is to be such that not only the young soldier settler, but his wife, may live in "contentment" and stick to the farm. We have not yet built the barn for the soldier settler, nor dug him a well nor cistern, nor fenced any portion of the farm, nor purchased or set out any fruit trees or any of the smaller fruit-bearing shrubs.

It will be borne in mind that inasmuch as the 230,000,000 of acres of public lands are largely "on the top of the Rocky Mountains" it

will be necessary to deal with State governments and private parties in the procurement of the land by the Government. In speaking of irrigation the Secretary of the Interior, on page 844, sundry civil hearings, refers to the Colorado River, the Snake River, the Sacramento River, the Platte River, and the St. Mary's River to afford him water for such purpose. How much money will the Government have to expend in order to check these rivers for irrigation purposes?

The Secretary says (p. 843, sundry civil hearings):

Effort has been made to colonize those lands and to cultivate them. That effort, in great part, has been a failure because they have not been handled in any more scientific or reasonable way than we have handled our public lands.

Still, on the same page, the Secretary says:

If you take those lands and divide them up into small farms, sufficiently large to support adequately a family of five, and center those farms in toward the settlement in a way somewhat similar to the Mormon settlements of Utah, with the nucleus of the settlement a community in which there would be some growing life; if you have every one of these farms connected up with that central community by a good road and by telephones, and have the central community either on a railroad or adjacent to one and connected with the railroad by a good wagon road; if you have that central community a marketing center so that the settlers can buy and sell cooperatively; if you have some of the evidences of civilization in that community, such as a good school, instead of the single-room schoolhouse that we have very generally where we pay the teacher \$40 a month and she teaches everything from the A B C's to higher algebra; if you have a moving-picture show and a good store and other evidences of community life, you will be able to do the one thing that seems to me ought to be done throughout the entire United States if we are going to maintain this as an agricultural country, and that is, make the women contented.

May I ask who are we going to get to build the railroads into all these settlements proposed—the Railroad Administration or the bankrupt concerns? Remember, that the project contemplates getting these soldier boys onto these farms quickly, and where is the money coming from to-day to accomplish all of these vast projects? Does it not suggest a beautiful dream. I should not take up the time to quote all that the Secretary says, but ask you to turn to the sundry civil appropriation bill hearings for full information. The Secretary, on page 845 of the hearing, also says on this same subject, "the farmer should learn to buy fertilizer by the carload," which everybody knows would be necessary in order to bring this stump land into any sort of condition for agricultural purposes. Who is going to furnish fertilizer to the young soldier-farmer. The Secretary asks him to "chip in" a few dollars to pay for a co-operative creamery or to have him raise the standard of his hogs and of his cattle. The Secretary further says:

All of these things require a good deal of education, and so we want to have an agricultural educator in each one of these settlements, who will tell the settlers what kind of crops should be put in and how the crops should rotate in order to maintain the fertility of the soil.

Is it proposed that the soldier boy shall spend the time in acquiring an education in agriculture after he shall have dug in the ditches for a year to drain the swamp land or has helped to pull stumps from the sandy land of the north, whereby he is to earn at least \$500,

before he goes onto the land and before he can commence to put in a crop?

The Secretary is made to say, on page 847 of the hearings:

We have had a very active canvass of the South, and there are a great many million acres down there, chiefly along the coastal plain, which have been cut over, need drainage, in fact, can not be used without drainage, that are available and that will be extremely useful.

At the top of the page 848 the Secretary says:

Oh, yes; I saw in North Carolina what is marked on the map the Great Green Swamp, which you would think was something like the Dismal Swamp, or worse; that you could not go into it. That was developed by some timbermen, chiefly from Minnesota, and they have taken part of it and driven a big canal through every mile, and then put in small lateral drainage canals, I think about every 40 acres. I went into the heart of that thing, where they had cut over a lot of the land and let a fire sweep over it; then they had a lot of boys carrying a string, as they went along, stretching out over the field, and at every pace they would take a stick and push it down 5 or 6 inches in the ground, then drop a couple of seeds of corn in. They had gone over this 200 acres in that way. I saw that land when there was corn on it 10 feet high; no plow had ever been put into it; it had never been hoed, and the bins were full of ears of corn a foot long—wonderfully productive stuff. I fancy the whole South has vast areas of lands like that. I know of one association down there that has 40,000,000 acres of unused, and they claim, tillable land.

Now, if it is not true that the soldier boy is not to be put upon this land, there is no use of talking about it, but if it is necessary to dig a big canal every mile and put in small lateral drainage canals a huge amount of money is going to be required to bridge these canals because the good roads proposed will be of no avail unless the canals are bridged.

This land was necessarily very moist where the Secretary saw them planting corn 5 or 6 inches deep. It may be the proper thing to plant corn in the swamps of North Carolina at that depth, but when I was taught farming I was told to plant it shallow when the ground was in a damp condition and deeper when the ground was dry.

Speaking of the everglades of Florida, the Secretary says, on page 848 (sundry civil hearing):

That land is, of course, just filled with the seepage of hundreds of thousands of years, and there are a million—I think it is a million and three hundred thousand or a million and one hundred thousand—acres of such land that is owned by the State of Florida. All that land has been turned over to a board which has been given plenary power, and they would put that or any portion of it at our disposal. * * * And too much emphasis can not be put on drainage. I think drainage in the United States is just as important as irrigation. The South has been cursed for 50 years, not so much by the war as by its reputation for having malaria and yellow fever. And we have got to take those lands and clean out the water so that the malaria or yellow-fever mosquito can not breed there; and we can then make those lands perfectly wholesome.

The Secretary again proposes good roads, good enough for the soldier farmer to run an automobile over them. This young farmer will probably not buy an automobile the first year.

We now come to the proposition as to some of the things that the young soldier will be required to pay for in advance, according to the plan. Secretary Lane, on page 850 says:

My contract would be that that man should go on and pay. I think a reasonable figure would be 10 per cent in advance. We estimate that these farms will cost, improved, between \$4,000 and \$5,000 apiece, and that a man would pay perhaps \$400 or \$500 down.

Mr. Gillett asks the question: "Where would he get it?"

Secretary Lane answers, "By working on the project. You see he makes his own farm, and he would work on it, and we would give him decent wages. He can save enough for the first payment if he is thrifty at all, and we would not want him if he was not. There ought to be a little latitude there. We ought not to be forced to take any fellow who did not have any aptitude for this thing and who did not show the slightest desire to be a farmer, but simply wanted to grab hold of one of these farms."

I do not anticipate that it would be necessary to increase the Secret Service to an alarming extent in order to prevent most of the boys from attempting to grab one of these farms.

On page 851 the Secretary says:

After he gets on there we hope to be able to subordinate our lien, or make it run concurrently with a loan from the farm loan bank, by which, under proper supervision, he could get money that would go into actual things, such as cattle and sheep and hogs, and perhaps increment, so that you could keep an eye on him and see what kind of use he makes of the money.

On page 854 the question is propounded:

Does your scheme contemplate any contribution on the part of the individual? Secretary Lane: Yes; an initial payment on the part of the individual of 10 per cent of the cost of the project.

In this connection please bear in mind that the Secretary estimates that the farm will cost the Government \$4,000 or \$5,000 so that the young farmer-soldier boy must pay upon that valuation \$400 or \$500. The Government will in addition loan him \$1,200 for improvements; to this he must add \$400. That makes \$900 that he must pay down. On top of this I believe any practical farmer will tell you that the young soldier boy will have to put up in addition to the \$1,600 for improvements at least \$2,000 in order to bring his farm up anywhere near the ideal condition that the Secretary suggests in order to make the young people "contented."

Gentlemen, it is a great scheme, but it won't work. It is a fine word picture, but you can't realize on it.

I also desire to refer you to Secretary Lane's testimony at a hearing before the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, Friday, January 10, 1919. I will not detain you long, but will give a few quotations therefrom.

On page 9 the Secretary said:

Now, gentlemen, I have asked, and I think Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina has put in an amendment to the appropriation bill for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for this plan. My only regret about that is that the amount is so small. It is ridiculously, absurdly small. * * * Let us give to these men, on 40-acre farms or 50-acre farms, not merely the bare land, but a home upon the land, the cottage, the barn, the land fenced in, the land plowed, the first crop put in, the necessary farm implements, and have the place ready so he and his wife can move in immediately and go to work upon that place. * * * I would take all these boys personally and say to them, "If, after you have gone to your homes, and do not find the old job all ready and open for you, then here is a job for you. We will pay you the current rate of wages while you are clearing this ground, while you are removing the stumps and undergrowth, while you are draining this swamp, digging that ditch or building that dam in the Far West; we will give you good wages, we will take care of you in a barracks that will look palatial to you. Then, after you have worked for a year or two years upon that project, pick out your farm."

On page 11 it is shown that the Secretary said:

We can not possibly give employment to more than 100,000.

This was said in the light of the appropriation of \$100,000,000. Later on the same page it was recorded that the Secretary said:

But we ought to have work for the man when he comes back and if times become hard three months from now, I want you to think about this proposition—that in Michigan and Wisconsin we can put at work just as many men as will be out of employment in the Great Central West, and down in North and South Carolina and Florida and Louisiana we can put more men at work—hundreds of thousands of men, if need be, and care for them. All that will be necessary will be to have the money. We can not do it with \$100,000,000.

Figures talk: The plan of the Secretary of the Interior was to work 100,000 men with or under an appropriation, as proposed, of \$100,000,000. Now it is proposed to appropriate as a starter \$500,000,000, and it is not easy to arrive at any other conclusion from the Secretary's testimony that he would work 500,000 men under the \$500,000,000 appropriation as he says he can work hundreds of thousands of men and care for them if he can get the money.

The Secretary can not expect soldiers to dig ditches and grub stumps, living in barracks away from home and in strange lands, even though the work is done by machinery, for less than a driver of a coal wagon is receiving, to wit, \$5 per day; 500,000 men, and that is only 1 in 8 of the whole number of soldiers, at \$5 per day will cost \$2,500,000 for every eight hours work, or \$65,000,000 per month of 26 days. If the \$500,000,000 was all devoted to the payment of wages to the soldiers it would last seven months or a little over. However, we can not start this plan from that end. The land proposed to be built up into thousands and thousands of farms will first have to be purchased, as the Secretary is not authorized under this bill to spend the \$500,000,000 in payment of wages, machinery, mobilization of the army of 500,000 soldiers, and in addition to the Interior Department of thousands of experts, governors, superintendents, and run up millions and millions to be taken care of in deficiency appropriations. The sum of money to be expended before a shovelful of dirt is removed or a stump pulled is beyond my comprehension, and I doubt if anyone has taken a pencil in hand to estimate it. The probabilities are, making a fair guess, that before the real work started a good share of this \$500,000,000 would have been expended and the Secretary of the Interior would not have funds sufficient to pay the wages of the 500,000 soldiers for 7 months nor of 100,000 soldiers for 3 months.

If Congress saddles this scheme on to the Government no man in Congress to-day will live to see the time when the debt incurred is liquidated. This is the debit side of the question. The other question, that is more easily presented, is the fact that no considerable per cent of the soldiers will invest in the proposition. More than a million of the soldiers have now returned from France, about 70 per cent of the whole number on this side discharged and yet the labor market has not collapsed, and I do not believe the soldier boys intend to create any disturbance in this country. The soldier has the right to be counseled as to what he desires, and should not be farmed off on land that is old and worthless, under all the plans laid down for them; with governors and overseers to live among them, to tell them

what to do and how to do it, and to see that they do not rob the Government.

Congress has already appropriated \$200,000 to make the survey of the swamp and cutover lands, and in this connection Mr. Lane says, "We have not had enough money to make complete reconnaissance." Anyone is justified in coming to the conclusion, after reading the record, that this general survey at an expense of \$200,000 has been in most part if not entirely a survey by the eye. Mr. Lane also says on page 13 of hearings before Committee on Irrigation, Sixty-third Congress:

"One of the things we ought to know definitely very quickly is whether you are going to do this or not, because we have got to get a personnel, the directing and managerial men together, and we ought to know in advance whether this will go through so as to plan for an organization in each one of these States. We practically will have to have 45 or more different organizations."

Mr. Lane says on page 14 (same hearings): "On the irrigation projects in the West it might be that 20 or 30 acres will be ample," speaking of the size of the soldier's farm. "In the South he would probably get more than on the irrigation project—probably 50, 60, 80, or 100 acres, depending upon the kind of agriculture for which that project was fitted."

Page 16, same hearings, Mr. Lane says:

You know that private irrigation schemes failed in the West very largely because, after some years of experiment, private capital would no longer go into it, and then the United States was forced into the enterprise.

Mr. OLIVER. Do any of your plans contemplate asking for State cooperation and help?

Secretary LANE. All our plans do, but I very much doubt if we will get more out of the States than advice and counsel and education of the men and some consideration, perhaps, after the projects are founded. We did think it might be possible for the States to buy the land and turn the land over to us. But I think that is very unlikely.

There has been much talk about the Capitol since Congress was convened in this extraordinary session concerning the average price that the Government would have to pay for the land, and the consensus of opinion seems to be that it would cost the Government about \$15 per acre. It is very easy to believe that if the Government gets started in such a way as that it can not well withdraw, the price for this land will materially advance. I believe that to be the history of most land deals.

Now, in order to be reasonable and to accommodate those gentlemen who are opposed to my reading this entire manuscript, it may be understood that I may hand my manuscript to the clerk and that it will be printed in the record. If that is done I will omit a great portion of it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection to that, that may be done.

Mr. JOHNSON. To be fair, I will withdraw any objection I have to it. I am a southerner.

Mr. BOIES. I attempt to give some figures here that show where the Government would land if Mr. Lane's proposition is carried out;

The several departments of the working organization of this Government are helpful and proper when they confine themselves to the power and authority intended to be conferred. I believe that it is generally conceded that man is a selfish being. I also believe that it is well known that the departments in the State as well as

in the Nation, where no budget system is in vogue, are grabbing for about all the money they can get for their departments in order to make the best showing possible. Our present plan has been in existence altogether too long, and there appears now to be a genuine desire to work out some practical so-called budget system for this Government—all hail the day.

In conclusion I desire to acquaint you with the opinion of a soldier, with whom I am not acquainted, who wrote me from Des Moines, Iowa, under date June 3, 1919, as follows:

HON. JUDGE BOIES, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR JUDGE: The writer, who has just been discharged from service, although not being as fortunate as a good many of my comrades in that I was stationed in this country while being in the Army, has just read an article in the Register and Tribune, of Des Moines, dated June 3, 1919.

I agree with you, Judge, that the average soldier does not wish any land, but does very much prefer a liberal bonus of some kind. We did not hesitate when we were called and gave up our business or in whatever line we were to serve this country.

Nearly every returned soldier from Iowa was very much disappointed upon finding that Iowa did not give each man a bonus of some kind. For instance, North Dakota gave each returned soldier \$25 per month for every month he was in the service, while Minnesota, I am advised, has given \$25 for every two months.

Most of the boys with whom I have talked about this proposition claim that they are trying to unload some southern swamp land upon us, and I urge you in behalf of the rest of the boys of Iowa to have Congress make an appropriation giving the returned soldiers a liberal bonus.

I wish to now record my attitude toward the brave young man who offered his services in behalf of his country and in behalf of humanity by saying that I stand ready to vote for a cash payment to him, or in the form of bonds, in the sum of \$25 to \$50 for every month that he was detained in the Government service.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I thank you very kindly for your patience. I have spoken my piece. Those who believe with me will probably approve; those who do not will undoubtedly criticize. I realize fully that I am responsible for what I have said and am willing to take the consequences. The only regret I have is that I did not have sufficient time to present this address in a more acceptable manner.

Now, there is an addendum with reference to the examinations before your committee that I did not have an opportunity to examine, as the print did not come into my hands until yesterday evening.

MR. ELSTON. What is the form of the addendum?

MR. BOIES. It is just headed "Addendum."

MR. ELSTON. What does it contain?

MR. BOIES. It contains hearings that you have had before you here and comments thereon.

MR. ELSTON. It is all to be included in this record of your speech?

MR. BOIES. Yes, sir.

MR. TAYLOR. Is it something you wrote yourself, Judge, this addendum?

MR. BOIES. Yes, sir.

MR. ELSTON. And you want it included as part of the record?

MR. BOIES. Yes.

MR. TAYLOR. I didn't know; you stated you didn't have time to examine it.

Mr. BOIES. I would not put it upon anybody else's shoulders, that they wrote any of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You said you had not had a chance to examine it.

ADDENDUM.

The hearings before the Committee on the Public Lands of the House of Representatives, May 27 to 31, 1919, being Part I, which was not distributed from the printer's hands until yesterday evening, I have had but very little time to examine.

Mr. Mondell, appearing before that committee (see p. 6), said: "I conferred with the officials of the Interior Department, with the Secretary of the Interior, and with the gentlemen who he called to his aid, among others, Mr. Cory and Mr. Smythe. * * * So the bill you have before you is my bill only in the sense that I availed myself of all of the suggestions that had been made and that had been urged in regard to the legislation."

On page 15, Mr. Elston said: "In other words, Mr. Mondell, although this is an authorization for \$500,000,000, the first appropriation for this current year need not necessarily be the full amount; it might be much less.

"Mr. MONDELL. My thought is at this time, and I do not make that suggestion as at all conclusive or as intended to bind anybody, that \$100,000,000 or \$125,000,000 at the most, is all that could be economically expended within a year."

Mr. Raker, on page 17, said: "What I want to do is to get your view on the matter, and later the view of the committee, as to whether you believe it advisable under any circumstances to permit the obtaining of a home under any of these projects and then permit regulations to be promulgated or authority extended by the Secretary of the Interior, whereby the homesteader—and that is what I want to call him—could live in town and not live upon his farm or home; that is, not make his home his permanent place of abode.

"Mr. MONDELL. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that, because that is exactly one of the things I had in mind in drafting the language of this provision, and if you will note the language you will see it authorizes the soldier to live anywhere in the settlement. The thought is that the Secretary shall require the soldier to live in the settlement."

Mr. Baer, on page 22, said: "There is only one more qualification to be considered and that is experience. If the applicant is a farmer's boy and has lived on the farm for years, he would be more likely to be a successful farmer than some clerk in a store. The trouble is that they will try to get people who are clerks in stores or banks who can no more run a farm than a farmer's son can run the First National Bank of New York. They are not experienced and do not know anything about it."

Mr. Ferris, on page 23: "A soldier came to me yesterday and with bated breath said that this would not amount to anything for the soldiers, because it requires him to put up one-fourth of the money for the improvements and 5 per cent of the purchase price of the land. He said that for that reason, the soldiers being penniless, this will be of no value to them. I did not agree with him, but I thought it well to call attention to it."

(I request that the committee have here printed at this point with my remarks, the Secretary's questionnaire, including its heading, found on pages 33, 34, and 35.)

Secretary Lane, on page 35: "We have about 100,000 men still left in France, and I do not know what percentage of the men in the cantonments have been demobilized, but you must realize that as an outgrowth of this bill, if you were to give us this year \$125,000,000 that would take care of approximately 25,000 farms, so that the drain made upon farm labor in New York could not be very great.

"Mr. SNELL. I am especially interested in the condition of the farmers at the present time. I represent a purely agricultural district, and there is absolutely no help to be obtained to work on the farms. All of our people are very much interested in anything that will tend to disturb what little farm labor there is."

It seems to me if a project of this kind were established in the central part of New York State in which you would employ, say, 1,000 men, paying them \$4 or \$5 per day, the few farm laborers that we have would flock down there.

Legitimate farmers could not compete with that sort of market for labor and make a living.

Mr. SNELL. How many men would you put on a project in its initial stages, for instance?

Secretary LANE. I would suppose that if we got 4,000 men on a project that we would be doing extremely well.

Mr. SNELL. Page 36: "The taking of 4,000 farm laborers from central New York would absolutely cripple us with what we have there at the present time."

Secretary LANE. These men are not farm laborers, but they are men who are interested in this proposition, or men who have been everything—street-car conductors, foresters, miners, etc. They are not farm laborers who have sent these requests to us. About 70 or 80 per cent of them are men who have had some agricultural experience.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that; but if you should establish one of those projects there, would not the boys in northern New York, for instance, say, "I would rather go down there and work for the Government for nice pay than to work as a common everyday farmer has to do in New York."

Secretary LANE. I should suppose they would. I should rather think that of I were a fellow with a chance like that, and who had been across in France, I would want to get some sort of farm for myself, and that if I saw an opportunity to get that farm I would not work regularly upon a farm for wages for somebody else, but would strike out for myself. I think we ought to give them that chance.

Mr. SNELL. But in doing that you would cripple the original farm industry in that section of the country.

Secretary LANE. Coming from a farming section, as you know I do, because I come from one of the great farming sections of the country, I know that at this time of the year the farmer is always busy and always unhappy because of the prospect of shortage of labor. Last year I remember distinctly, when the war was on, how utterly hopeless the promise was that there would be a sufficient amount of farm labor to harvest the crops; and yet you in New York got your women into the fields, and they were enthusiastic about it.

Does the Secretary of the Interior intend to build these soldiers' homes so attractive as that the wife will be altogether "contented" and pass lightly over the fact that the New York women are required to work in the fields?

Mr. RAKER (p. 39). Your answer just given that the man should live on his place practically answers the question I intended to put; that the man should live on his place, and if he had a little tract he could go to the town. Would it be advisable for us to put in this legislation some provision whereby they could form—as they are doing and as you have so successfully maintained in the West—an organization so you would have something to deal with directly and would not have to deal with each individual man where he had filed upon land or had taken out his homestead?

Secretary LANE. Of course, we can do that now. There is nothing to prevent the formation of such an association. We want to keep our individual hold upon the men, but I think it would be wise policy to provide for the organization of cooperative associations.

Mr. FERRIS (p. 41). Of course, there are 4,000,000 soldiers in the service of one kind and another, including the Army and Navy and all. Has anybody made a careful estimate as to what percentage of the 4,000,000 soldiers in all probability will desire to avail themselves of this law?

Secretary LANE. No one can.

Mr. FERRIS. Has anyone made an estimate?

Secretary LANE. No.

Yes; I think 250,000 of those little pamphlets were printed, and upon the basis of that figure 40,000 were returned to us. That would be 15 per cent, we will say.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us see if it would. You had 250,000 printed, or a quarter of a million, and 40,000 returned as undelivered?

Secretary LANE. No; 40,000 answers came back.

Mr. FERRIS. That would be almost one-fifth.

Secretary LANE. Not quite; about 16 per cent. Of course, there are 12,000 additional that are volunteer letters that have just come in.

Mr. FERRIS. Going on that basis, if 16 per cent made direct response out of a total queried of 250,000, then it might be a rough estimate, with some degree of accuracy, to say that 16 per cent of the entire 4,000,000 might make reply if they had an opportunity to do so.

Secretary LANE. I think that is perhaps as fair as anything you can get.

Mr. FERRIS. AS a mathematical proposition that would be about 640,000. Now, Mr. Secretary, I notice from reading the bill that there is no limit or exact sum fixed which the homesteader and the improvements thereon may cost; in other words, there is no maximum.

Secretary LANE. No.

We have figured about \$6,000. We will probably find that it will be a good deal more in some places and less in others.

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly that would be true; but a rough estimate of it is that the original purchase and the improvements thereon such as we have in contemplation here would average about \$6,000.

Then, if our other estimate had any value and this estimate had any value, it would be 640,000 soldiers multiplied by \$6,000 as the possible sum total that we might expend on this project; of course, all of us recognizing that that is a rough estimate.

Secretary LANE. Yes.

One word in this connection. I desire to present a few figures on the estimates of Mr. Ferris and the Secretary. It seems to be proposed to use about \$125,000,000 the first year. And it is estimated that this would improve 25,000 farms at \$5,000, instead of at \$6,000 a farm, according to the latest estimate of the Secretary, upon the proposition of working 4,000 men per project, which must mean 4,000 farms, according to the plan of having the soldier work on the project, at even \$5,000 per farm, amounts to \$20,000,000. It is in the record that the Secretary of the Interior proposed to work at the start 100,000 men, which would require the working of six projects, and six projects would practically consume \$125,000,000, mentioned by the Secretary for the first year, with 24,000 soldiers on the work.

Mr. Ferris says: "As a mathematical proposition that would be about 640,000 men," so that the Secretary of the Interior furnishing labor for 24,000 soldiers each year upon the six projects it would take 26 years to complete the job; and if he worked 100,000 each year, it would require more than six years' time to complete the job.

Then, again, if the estimate of 640,000 soldiers applied for farms at \$6,000 per farm, the Government would have invested \$3,840,000,000. In addition to this, it is proposed to loan each soldier at least \$800, which would make another investment on the part of the Government of \$512,000,000.

Such estimates as these, if anyone ever heard of them before, are easily about one-half the amount that will be required to carry out the project, and I think it is safe to multiply these amounts by two, as showing the real amount of money that the Government would find that it had invested. It is clear to my mind that the Secretary has had bad advice with reference to the cost of things in general, and this conclusion is reached from the testimony of Mr. Ferris, page 43: "Then suppose he needs a pair of mules, to get right down to the practical side of this live-stock proposition, which cost \$300, he would have to put up \$120 and the Government \$180, which he thought would be beyond his reach."

Secretary LANE. I doubt very much if that is so. You can change the percentage, of course, in any way you want; but I believe in challenging the best thing in the boy and making him feel from the start that he has got to be thrifty.

I believe it will look to the ordinary man from a critical examination of this whole plan that the soldier boy has been sufficiently challenged. While some one in the record—I will not take time to turn to it now—has stated that the soldier boy was not "a superman," I feel that if he accepts one of these jobs from the Secretary of the Interior and goes through with it to the end that he will have proved himself altogether "a superman."

Going back a little to Mr. Ferris's \$300-mule team: Some one should advise him that mule teams cost to-day from \$600 to \$800 per span. If this Government desires to issue ten billions more of its securities in the form of bonds, perhaps they had better adopt the plan of the Secretary of the Interior. If Congressmen are in favor of cutting down expenses of this Government they better throw this scheme into the ash barrel.

If Congress feels like doing anything for these soldier boys that is at all reasonable the Iowa delegation will stand with the majority will 11 votes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the judge a question, if he has completed?

Judge, will it bother you for me to ask you some questions?

Mr. BOIES. It might bother me, but then you have the right to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I appreciate my rights, Judge, but out of fairness to you I didn't want to bother you.

Do you know that the State of Georgia, the State of Alabama, the State of Louisiana, the State of Texas, and other Southern States have no representation here, and that the North, the East, and the West have practically all the representation around this table?

Mr. BOIES. I noticed that, and while—I did notice that, and after having read the proceedings of that big congress down there the thought came to me—I didn't know whether it was true or not if they were not purposely left off.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, Judge, do you not know that the State of Iowa, the State of Michigan, the State of Pennsylvania—that is, citizens of those States just named—own practically all the cut-over lands and timbered lands in the South, and that those people who live there own practically none of them?

Mr. BOIES. That is my understanding, that they are owned by speculators.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then your assault on the South—you mean to apply that as to the men who have gone from the North and from your own State—Iowa—the State of Michigan, and the State of Pennsylvania, and not to us southern people?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; I have no criticism to lodge against the southern gentlemen.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BOIES. It is the men down there with land to sell. I appreciate your southern gentlemen. I have visited in the South once or twice, and I like them.

Mr. JOHNSON. If you would come and stay a long time, we would make you a Democrat and move you down there. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, you talked to 40 soldiers out there in your home town?

Mr. BOIES. No, sir; I talked to over 40; but I didn't simply go around and talk to 40 soldiers—that is, I don't want the record to show that I went around and talked to 40 different soldiers. They were at the meeting gathered there. We have a town of 4,000, and there was as many there as you would get at a banquet, and I thought, congregated as they were, hit or miss, it was a fair representation.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they residents of your State or of other States?

Mr. BOIES. They are most of them residents of our State, I presume.

The CHAIRMAN. And you haven't found a soldier who is in favor of this plan?

Mr. BOIES. I have not talked with a soldier who was in favor of this plan.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, it is your idea that this is a reclamation project; and by reclamation project you mean a scheme to reclaim the arid lands of the West and the swamp lands of the South?

Mr. BOIES. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. And I suppose those soldiers had that same idea?

Mr. BOIES. I presume so.

Mr. MAYS. Did you take the vote after your speech?

Mr. BOIES. I didn't say a word with reference to the plan.

Mr. VAILE. How did you put the question?

Mr. BOIES. I just simply called their attention to the fact that there was, or would probably be, a bill in Congress to give soldiers some of the land in this country.

Mr. MAYS. Swamp land?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. You mentioned swamp land?

Mr. BOIES. Yes; I did. I had a right to. It is within the truth—swamp land and stump land.

Mr. MAYS. And it was after you mentioned swamp land that they voted?

• Mr. BOIES. How is that?

Mr. MAYS. After your designation of this land as swamp land, they cast their votes?

Mr. BOIES. They did not vote until after I made the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, you know the object of this bill, as stated in the bill, is to select one or more projects in each of the several States where a feasible project may be found; that this is not designed solely to reclaim the arid lands of the West and the swamp lands of the South; that it is not designed for that purpose.

Mr. BOIES. Who says so?

The CHAIRMAN. The Secretary of the Interior and the bill itself.

Mr. BOIES. The bill itself does not speak in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the bill says:

Projects shall be selected with a view to developing one or more projects in each of the several States in which feasible projects may be found.

Now, Secretary Lane has repeatedly called to the attention of Congress and to this committee the large areas of land existing in the Northern States, in the Northeast, in the North, aside from the West, and it is specifically stated that a project could be found, or projects were found, feasible in every State so far, with the exception of four States, one of those four being your own State, Iowa; but later examination may disclose a project in your State, although I doubt if there is a project in your State. Your State is so fertile and is all under cultivation that there probably wouldn't be anything there.

Mr. BOIES. Doesn't that contemplate a monster scheme—monstrous, I mean—in extent?

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the question. I am directing my question to your impression of the bill and the impression that your soldiers had, that it is a scheme solely to reclaim the swamp lands of the South and the arid lands of the West. Now, that theory being incorrect, that would not modify your views any, would it?

Mr. BOIES. My impression of the bill is gained by an examination of the history that led up to the introduction of this Mondell bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Judge, I am giving you some of the history of the bill, some of the genesis and the exact language of the Secretary of the Interior, who states that within 50 miles of the city of Washington there are numerous feasible projects. Now, Judge, your opinion and the opinion of these soldiers was formed because

you thought this was a proposition to reclaim the arid lands of the West and the swamp lands of the South; yet you have told this committee that you know nothing about the failure or the success of the reclamation or the irrigation of the arid lands of the West.

Mr. BOIES. Well, I don't think that the statement of the chairman is borne out by what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as a matter of fact, have you any knowledge, Judge, of the failure or of the success of the irrigated lands in the West?

Mr. BOIES. Just as I have said, only in a general way. But, then, my knowledge of that don't affect the proposition of its being a reclamation project, and I don't object to this Government going into a decent reclamation project, I don't care how large, when this country can afford it and the States in which it is located help to improve their own States.

Mr. ELSTON. Judge, that is the very question. Your main objection is that this is an extravagant proposition and will involve the Government in the expenditure of too much money?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; and that the soldier boy won't adopt it.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, your plan is to do what the soldier boy wants, and to do it immediately; is that it?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. All right. Now, you say that your plan is to give him six months' pay at \$50 a month.

Mr. BOIES. \$25 to \$50.

Mr. ELSTON. Make it \$50 for six months. That would be \$300, and 4,000,000 times \$300 for six months makes \$7,200,000,000. Then your plan, which involves economy and excludes extravagance, calls for the immediate outlay in actual money at this time of \$7,200,000,000; this plan here calls for the appropriation at the present time of only \$100,000,000. Now, as between the two plans, do you think yours is the most extravagant, or that the Lane plan is the most extravagant?

Mr. BOIES. The bill says \$500,000,000.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the authorization. It has been stated here over and over again that the uttermost appropriation that will be asked of the Appropriation Committee at this time will be \$100,000,000. This bill is an authorization of a maximum amount to be appropriated over a course of five years. Now, do you think, Judge, in your judgment, that in a matter of comparison between the two plans, yours can be characterized as reasonable, un wasteful, economic; while the Lane plan can be characterized as extravagant and wasteful?

Mr. BOIES. It is not in the blood of the American people to-day to deal economically with the soldier.

Mr. ELSTON. But you are putting your argument on that very basis. Your argument calls for the immediate expenditure of over \$7,000,000,000, which the Lane plan will never approximate.

Mr. BOIES. You forget, as the gentleman sitting next to me suggested, the pension to old soldiers goes out monthly. I thanked him for that suggestion. It probably ought to go out in that way to these soldiers, and if you will take the figures—they are set out there—if you take the figures of the Secretary of the Interior, the plan that is outlined by his own language, you will find that the expense, if car-

ried out according to his ideas—and he is given full authority by this bill—will amount to many billions of dollars.

Mr. ELSTON. No; the very utmost amount he can spend under this bill is \$500,000,000. That is the absolute limitation.

Mr. BOIES. That is in the start.

Mr. ELSTON. Well, that is up to Congress.

Mr. HERSMAN. Judge, don't you realize that under this bill the money is also to be paid back to the Government?

Mr. ELSTON. A revolving fund.

Mr. BOIES. No; the bill says it is not—or Mr. Mondell says in his argument that it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is not revolving.

Mr. HERSMAN. It is to be paid back, isn't it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; with interest.

Mr. BOIES. Well, if I am at all right, no considerable percentage of these soldiers will adopt this plan, and you won't have any soldiers to pay back the money.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just a moment; right on that point, Judge—do you not know that 1,578 of your own citizens, your own soldiers, have applied for homesteads under this plan?

Mr. BOIES. I have read that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you believe that it is true?

Mr. BOIES. Well, if you will allow me to answer one question before you put another—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). Secretary Lane says it is; that 1,578 men already have applied for these homesteads under the Lane plan.

Mr. BOIES. Now, the only knowledge that I have of that is the questionnaires sent out by Secretary Lane, and which I ask here to have incorporated as part of my address.

The CHAIRMAN. They are in the record. The secretary put them in.

Mr. BOIES. And I want the heading in.

Mr. ELSTON. It is in the record.

Mr. BOIES. That questionnaire didn't amount to very much to the boy in the trench or out in the fields, or wallowing in the mud. The heading is: "Hey, there; do you want a farm?" Of course, he wanted a farm if he could get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, Judge; that was not the idea conveyed. Here is what the secretary said:

Does the Government give me this farm for nothing?—Answer: No. And you wouldn't want the Government to do it. The plan is for you to arrange to pay for your farm in small payments after a long term of years, with interest charged at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

There was no lure held out to the soldier, no gold brick held up before him in that statement.

Mr. BOIES. Well, the heading is, as I state, isn't it?

Mr. VAILE. Judge, Iowa is now a very highly developed State agriculturally, isn't it?

Mr. BOIES. Yes; I think it is the best agricultural State in the Union. Land is selling there from \$350 to \$550 an acre.

Mr. MAYS. Right there, Judge; is there much show for a man without some means to get one of those farms?

Mr. BOIES. To get one of them?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. How?

Mr. BOIES. He must, perhaps, to-day be a little more than an ordinary man.

Mr. MAYS. We are dealing with ordinary men.

Mr. BOIES. But if he has the money that the Secretary of the Interior contemplates that he shall have before he can go on one of these improved farms, he can get a piece of land there on a small payment down or he would have enough to go on to a farm and rent; and I will tell you that the renter to-day can pay for a piece of land from three to five hundred dollars an acre at these prices, and some of them are doing it.

Mr. VAILE. Now, Judge, there is very little land in Iowa that needs to be irrigated or drained or cleared of stumps or otherwise reclaimed.

Mr. BOIES. It is stated that 97 per cent of it is tillable.

Mr. VAILE. It is one of the States referred to by Secretary Lane as not now being reported as having any available land for this project?

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Well, now, Judge, of course we all recognize the justice of your remark a few minutes ago, that all of us, no matter how fair we are, are somewhat affected by our own selfish interests. You would hardly expect the people of Iowa to be entirely exempt from that vice which is common to us all, would you?

Mr. BOIES. No, sir. I say that mankind is a little selfish, and I don't wish to be understood as putting myself above the ordinary man.

Mr. VAILE. We had a gentleman here the other day—he is here right now—who objected to this plan because he thought it was making competition with the farmer. Isn't it very possible, Judge, that the people of Iowa regard this as competition with them, with their lands already developed?

Mr. BOIES. No, sir; I don't care if it is competition. Every man that wants to farm and can find a piece of land to farm, or go into any other business under the Government, ought to be privileged to do so.

Mr. VAILE. Now, these soldiers that you talked to were men who were coming home to be demobilized or had been discharged?

Mr. BOIES. They had been discharged.

Mr. VAILE. So, most of them were Iowa soldiers?

Mr. BOIES. Yes. I dare say most of them were Iowa soldiers.

Mr. VAILE. Living on or in the neighborhood of the richest lands in the world?

Mr. BOIES. Well, most of them live in town and work at various propositions.

Mr. VAILE. They were not the class of men, mostly, who would care—who would have an inducement to move to some other new country, were they?

Mr. BOIES. Well, there are a good many of them there that are broke.

Mr. VAILE. At all events, their surroundings were calculated to encourage a man and assist a man to become wealthy, weren't they?

Mr. BOIES. Well, if a boy was straight and industrious, he would be assisted by most anybody that had the money to help him along.

Mr. VAILE. And furthermore, they didn't have before their eyes the sight of large tracts which could be readily developed by their own efforts?

Mr. BOIES. No; but if you read this whole record and got into what the Secretary says about this land down South, and one place where the timbermen had cleared off 200 acres of swamp land—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Judge, get away from the South a little while. This is not solely a southern proposition.

Mr. VAILE. I want to refer to one other question.

Mr. BOIES. But most of the record evidence backing up this bill comes from the South.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; that is not true, Judge.

Mr. TAYLOR. Judge, if this bill fails it will fail by reason of the opposition of the South.

Mr. BOIES. I am not talking about the southern man; I am agreeing with that man, I don't care where the man comes from, if he comes from my own town or my home—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). So far as I know, I am the only member of our delegation that is in favor of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is because you are posted on its merits.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have studied it.

Mr. VAILE. Isn't it a fact, Judge, that our point of view, as affected by self-interest, changes from time to time as conditions affecting our self-interest vary?

Mr. BOIES. I think so; but there isn't anything in my position that is affected by my self-interest.

Mr. VAILE. Isn't it a fact, Judge, that Iowa itself was settled very largely under the provisions of various soldier settlement acts, especially by veterans of the Civil War, who came out there under the liberal policy of the Government—came out there and settled those lands, the richest in the world?

Mr. BOIES. Not all through Iowa; but in my section of the State, where I have lived for 38 years, that is true. I don't mean to say that is generally so, but a great many soldiers took up homesteads there.

Mr. VAILE. So the interest, now that it is fully developed, would be different from that which existed immediately following the Civil War.

Mr. BOIES. Yes; because if these boys could go and homestead any such land as that now we would all want them to homestead it, and they would be desirous of homesteading it.

Mr. VAILE. If they had a chance to homestead that kind of land anywhere they ought to be allowed to do it, shouldn't they?

Mr. BOIES. Yes; but the record shows there isn't any such land as that to homestead.

Mr. VAILE. That is a question.

Mr. BOIES. And nothing to give them a farm until the Government takes hold of it and reclaims it.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment there, so that we may not get a misapprehension of that. When Iowa was opened for settlement, it was opened for everybody, the soldier and the man who was not a soldier. Isn't that right?

Mr. BOIES. Every citizen of the United States possessing the qualifications of a homesteader had that right.

Mr. RAKER. And the only advantage that the soldier got that went to Iowa was that he was allowed to get a patent in a shorter space of time than the man who had not been in the service?

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And he got no other advantage. Isn't that true?

Mr. BOIES. Not that I recall.

Mr. RAKER. So, therefore, it shows that the benefits we are talking about to the soldier, soldiers' scrip, so far as it applies to Iowa, is not true. The soldier did not sell his scrip, but he went out and located himself and made a farm.

Mr. BOIES. Well, I don't think the Iowa soldier homesteader had any scrip to sell.

Mr. RAKER. Then he did become a farmer himself?

Mr. BOIES. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. Now just one other question. You have spoken in glowing terms of Iowa.

Mr. BOIES. The questions pulled that out of me. I didn't intend to say that.

Mr. ELSTON. You are not going to refer to California in that connection, are you, Judge?

Mr. RAKER. I have a question that will elicit a good answer. Let me repeat what I said—I want to make it short—you have spoken in glowing terms of Iowa, the men working there, and the value of the land, etc., now why is it that 60,000 of your citizens have gone to one county in California alone within the last 10 years?

Mr. BOIES. Because they have grown rich, and you have some nice sky and flowers out there, and men who want to take their money away from them. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELSTON. Is that satisfactory, Judge. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Now there are just a few matters that I want to ask, if I may have the privilege, and then I will not interrupt anybody else. It has been stated here inferentially that this committee was not representative. Now, as a matter of fact, we have two southern men on the committee, and you don't expect to present here the fact that because the committee did not come from certain States it would affect their attitude in hearings on this bill, and their judgment in reporting it out, did you?

Mr. BOIES. Not at all, and I tried to fortify the record so that no man could go out of here and say that I did.

Mr. RAKER. Exactly. Of course, there are committees of the House on which for years there has been no representative from the West, the Intermountain States, or the Pacific coast, and it is still true. They can't get on.

Now, Judge, in your presentation here you are trying to convey to the committee the idea that you are opposed to this bill, but suppose it should be workable and part of our soldiers were given an opportunity to get a home at a reasonable price and pay for it eventually, you would be in favor of such legislation, wouldn't you?

Mr. BOIES. You mean the soldier will pay for it eventually?

Mr. RAKER. Yes, that is what this bill provides.

Mr. BOIES. Yes, sir; if there is any considerable number of soldiers who want to adopt this plan, I would be willing that it go through, and if it could be ascertained just how many, so that it might also

be ascertained what sum of money would be required to locate those soldiers so, as the Secretary of the Interior says, their wives would be contented—a nice place to live—I would agree to that, too.

Mr. MAYS. You estimated awhile ago there would be 3 per cent. How many would that make altogether?

Mr. BOIES. That would make about 240,000.

Mr. MAYS. Do you know how many this bill would care for—its provisions?

Mr. BOIES. About 640,000.

Mr. MAYS. I hardly think so.

Mr. BOIES. The provisions of this \$500,000,000?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. BOIES. Why, no; that would provide for about 24,000 times six.

Mr. MAYS. So that 3 per cent of the soldiers, if your estimate is correct, would occupy all the lands made available under this bill, wouldn't they?

Mr. BOIES. Yes, I think it would, and I think before you got through with that you would have an awful debt on hand.

Mr. MAYS. So, if 3 per cent of the soldiers would desire to take advantage of this bill, you would be for it to that extent, would you?

Mr. BOIES. If it can be shown to me what it is going to cost, and that they will furnish something that the soldier—that is of benefit to the soldier.

Mr. MAYS. Well, a home is usually of some benefit, isn't it?

Mr. BOIES. Yes; but how are you going to furnish the soldier a home who hasn't got a cent, as the Secretary of the Interior says, hasn't got enough money to buy a shack—how is he going to pay the four or five hundred dollars cash down, and then after the Government loans him \$800, put in \$400 himself?

Mr. MAYS. Well, there are provisions in this bill for payment for work that he may do to help out such a soldier as you mention.

Mr. BOIES. Yes; but the Secretary of the Interior proposes that the Government shall go on and prepare this farm and build the houses and put the crop in.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; it doesn't go that far.

Mr. BOIES. There is a record of that—

The CHAIRMAN. No; there is no provision for putting in a crop.

Mr. BOIES. I may be mistaken as to the Secretary saying that, but if he didn't, some other man did who was at the meeting with him.

The CHAIRMAN. That was said, probably, at this convention you refer to, but it is not in the bill.

Mr. BOIES. But he has talked about the bathtub in the house and about good roads and about railroads being built into these projects and that it ought to be done quickly. Now, who is going to build railroads to-day? The Railroad Administration or the bankrupt railroads?

Mr. BAER. The railroads in Iowa when they found that that land was good for farming—a lot of railroads went in there.

Mr. BOIES. They didn't build them for a great many years, either. I want to know who is going to build railroads quickly.

Mr. BAER. I think the trouble is, Judge, you can't adjust your mind to 50 years ago, because you were a pretty young man when our

fathers went out to get homesteads. There was lots of free land then, but these soldiers are not in the same condition. They haven't any land.

Mr. BOIES. I was born on a homestead, 65 miles west of Chicago, and my people cheated me out of fame because they moved out of the log house on January 1 and I was born in the new house on January 3.

Mr. BAER. I was born in a log house 100 miles north of Chicago and they didn't cheat me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. White wants to ask a question, Judge.

Mr. WHITE. Do you think that the competition that would result from the products of those farms that might be established through the operation of this bill would have any effect whatever upon the price of agricultural products?

Mr. BOIES. I don't know whether it would have any effect upon the agricultural products of the country, and it would not have, in my judgment, a bad effect upon the condition of the people and the cost of living. You can't get too much competition in the world for the good of mankind in the way of raising foodstuffs.

Mr. WHITE. You don't believe, do you, that there is any prejudice whatever in the minds of the farmers of your State toward this proposition for that particular reason, do you?

Mr. BOIES. I know there is not.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. BOIES. I happen to own a little land in Iowa, and I did work some of it myself along with my boy before he enlisted, but when he came back he didn't want to go back to the farm. He went to selling tractor engines. I don't care how much competition you get into the farming business.

Mr. WHITE. You don't believe they care, either?

Mr. BOIES. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Judge, in your opening statement, you intimated very strongly that the people most interested in this legislation were the land owners, and included the owners of swamp lands and the owners of arid lands in the West. Do you not know that practically all of the arid lands in the West that would be reclaimed are in the public domain and not in private ownership at all?

Mr. BOIES. Secretary Lane says that the greater part of the public lands are on top of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. SMITH. That may be true, but there are great quantities of arid lands that could be reclaimed that are still in the public domain and are useless until they are reclaimed. You are mistaken when you assume that we are interested in this bill because somebody has got some land to sell out there. The land we would reclaim is in the public domain.

Mr. BOIES. Well, I have lived in the West all of my life, and I know how the land business is transacted.

Mr. SMITH. Do you know how it has been conducted from a governmental standpoint?

Mr. BOIES. Not from the governmental standpoint, but I know I have been in the Rocky Mountains, too.

Mr. SMITH. You probably rode through in a Pullman car.

Mr. BOIES. Well, I have walked around there.

Mr. SMITH. Now, you say the land in Iowa is worth from \$300 to \$500 an acre on the average?

Mr. BOIES. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. \$250 an acre on the average? What chance has a poor young man in Iowa to get a foothold on the soil there? This legislation is intended to give the Iowa boys a chance to get a home in some other section of the country; for instance, out in our country we have probably 10 or 15 per cent of the people who came from your State.

Mr. BOIES. You are as competent to judge of that as I am, and I don't—I am not arguing against this land, the Government land, being reclaimed, and I am not arguing against the man who owns the swamp lands of the South or the stump land on the sandy districts of the North putting their land upon the market if they can, and I wouldn't be against Government aid in helping the States to get their lands under cultivation, but I don't want it done quickly, as they are asking for at this time, because of the \$24,000,000,000 of debts that we know something about, and more coming in that we don't know anything about.

Mr. SMITH. If we made these young men self-sustaining by putting them on farms, they would help to pay this enormous debt.

Mr. BOIES. You are not going to get these young men on the farms, according to this plan of the Secretary of the Interior—you are not going to get them to work under two or three years.

Mr. SMITH. We expect to give them work constructing these projects as soon as the bill is passed.

Mr. BOIES. You will get about 24,000 of them the first year, and the balance of the 100,000 would be waiting for four years before the last twenty-four or twenty-five thousand would get a chance to go on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, just one question. Do you realize, when you speak of the land schemes and the land sales that will be put over upon the Government—do you realize the safeguards under this bill and the legislative situation surrounding the bill; that this bill is a bill solely for an authorization; it does not appropriate any money, and before the money can be made available the Appropriations Committee of the House and yourself will have an opportunity to pass upon the specific projects that are to be developed; that it is contemplated that the first year we can spend about \$75,000,000; that whatever service has this in charge, if under the Secretary of the Interior he will not have carte blanche to spend that money, but he has got to put his cards upon the table before the Appropriations Committee, and they will report to the House an item in the appropriation bill, and the project will be disclosed and the scheme will be disclosed upon which the \$75,000,000 is to be expended.

Mr. BOIES. Where does the evidence of that sort of a plan appear?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the requirement of the rules of the House.

Mr. BOIES. This is turned over absolutely under this bill—the \$500,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that appears in the last section, and I know a great many new Members—and I was confused myself on the dif-

ference between an authorization and an appropriation for several years—"That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act the sum of \$500,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated." Now, that is an authorization. This committee can not make an appropriation. The Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee. We give them the authorization of law, the statute which enables them to make the appropriation; then the Secretary of the Interior has to come before the committee, the Appropriations Committee, as he does to-day in the matter of reclamation expenditures, and disclose to the committee and be subjected to a cross-examination before the Appropriations Committee will approve the item. Then that is reported to the House, and we vote on it a second time. That is the procedure, and that is the safeguard surrounding a matter of this kind.

Mr. BOIES. I tell you that when the Government goes out to buy this land spoken of for this purpose they are more liable than otherwise to get cheated. The Government is not a good land agent, and it is not a good buyer generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government can't buy this land, Judge, except as directed by the Appropriations Committee, presided over by the gentleman from your own State, Mr. Good.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. And it is also true, Judge, that there would be a great deal of land that would be given absolutely, either by the State or by the owner, to the Federal Government for this purpose.

Mr. BOIES. Secretary Lane says he don't believe that is true. He says about the only thing they will get from the States is a little advice—maybe some help after the project is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, there is a captain in the Army here. I promised him that he could go on, so that he could leave to catch a train.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to ask one question: Do you believe that the \$300 that you have suggested be given to the soldiers in cash would do the average soldier more good than if a feasible scheme could be worked out to make him the proprietor of a farm?

Mr. BOIES. If a feasible scheme could be worked out so as to give the soldier boy a farm, it ought to be done, when this Government can afford it.

Mr. HERSMAN. Well, now, Judge, one more question. Don't you know that this committee is trying to work out a feasible scheme, with the assistance of the experts of this Government that are well informed as to what schemes are possible?

Mr. BOIES. I haven't any knowledge of what this committee is trying to do. All the knowledge I have is what Secretary Lane is trying to do, with the assistance of men who have land to sell.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, just one more question: Do you feel that you have fairly canvassed this matter among the soldiers to determine whether or not they want it?

Mr. BOIES. I think I have canvassed it more thoroughly than any other man, outside of the Secretary of the Interior, who has made any report upon the question, that I know anything about.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. ELLIS BASHURE, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Capt. BASHURE. I am at present in the financial section of the Army. I will not take up very much of your time, gentlemen. The reason that I am very much interested in this hearings that when the little questionnaire came out from the War Department I called our little garrison together—700 men—read the questionnaire to them, explained everything that they wanted explained, and we found that 87 per cent of our garrison of 700 men wanted Government farms. We explained to them that they were not going to be given anything; that they would have to pay for everything they got; that it was not a gratuity in any sense of the word.

Our men were composed 10 per cent from South Carolina; three-quarters, in equal proportions from the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Indiana. The remaining 15 per cent were scattered, some Mississippians, some Californians, and they were scattered generally all over the country. Three-quarters of them, however, were from the middle section of the country, either the North or the middle section.

I do not think, from my own observation, from the questions that I put to these men, that they want a gratuity. I think they want farms. They are thrown now on their own resources. We jerked them out of good jobs and told them to serve their country, and they did it; and we are throwing them back with no jobs, with nothing to do. My folks are in California now, and they tell me there are a lot of soldiers, unemployed men, in Los Angeles. I think Judge Raker will bear me out in that. There are a lot more in New Orleans, a lot more in Atlanta, and it seems to me that something should be done as soon as possible; and it seems to me, too, that the only feasible method is the Lane method.

That is about all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. You have talked to these men personally, Captain?

Capt. BASHURE. I talked to them personally. The questionnaires were distributed and after four days spent in interviews with them, the matter was brought to a straw vote by receiving these cards from them, for their expression of opinion as to whether they wanted a farm or did not want a farm. Eighty-seven per cent of our garrison of 700 men wanted a Government farm on those terms.

The CHAIRMAN. They thoroughly understood that this was not a gratuity?

Capt. BASHURE. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Or an absolute bounty or charity?

Capt. BASHURE. Yes, sir. This one thing was brought out very forcibly to me. A great many of these men were taxpayers and they objected to a gratuity, because they realized that they would only be taking out of one pocket to put into another.

The CHAIRMAN. How long ago was it that you canvassed this matter?

Capt. BASHURE. That was the time this questionnaire came out. That was, I should say, February or March of this year.

The CHAIRMAN. And have you had any general talk with them or canvass since that time?

Capt. BASHURE. Not since that time; no.

The CHAIRMAN. In what capacity are you acting now?

Capt. BASHURE. At present I am attached to the Finance Section of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a demobilizing officer?

Capt. BASHURE. I was demobilizing officer at the remount station, Camp Shelby.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any such experience as Judge Boies had?

Capt. BASHURE. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not find anything like the adverse sentiment that he found?

Capt. BASHURE. I found no adverse sentiment at all. I found some men that did not care for farms, because they were city men and did not think they had the necessary training to become farmers. But there was no one opposed to it at all, so far as I could find out.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any members of the committee desire to ask the captain any questions?

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask, Captain, what is your native State?

Capt. BASHURE. Virginia, by parentage; California, by education; and Mississippi by citizenship.

Mr. BENHAM. And how many years—how much of your time have you spent in California and how much in Mississippi?

Capt. BASHURE. I have been in Mississippi a year and four months. I came to California immediately after my birth in Virginia. I am now 38 years old, so I have spent practically 36 years in California, in central and southern California.

Mr. VAILE. As demobilizing officer did you have any connection whatever with the Reclamation Service?

Capt. BASHURE. Not in the least.

Mr. VAILE. Merely and entirely military?

Capt. BASHURE. Entirely military; no feeling one way or the other.

Mr. VAILE. What are the duties of the demobilizing officer?

Capt. BASHURE. Simply to pay off the men, prepare their records, and send them in. I was acting as adjutant at the same time. In other words, I was running the office of the remount division.

Mr. VAILE. Did you have any cooperation with such agencies as the Red Cross in regard to placing men or seeing where they could be placed after they got out of the service?

Capt. BASHURE. We had a representative of the United States Employment Service call on us frequently. We were in close cooperation with them, and we had the local establishment of the Y. M. C. A., but the principal work was with the Government Employment Service.

Mr. VAILE. Your putting this questionnaire to these men, or interrogating them about it, was the result of your previous activities in seeing where men could be placed in employment?

Capt. BASHURE. That was the point. I didn't want to turn my men out without any place to go, because I realized that it would probably lead to crime of some sort if they were thrown out with nothing to do and no place to make a livelihood.

Mr. VAILE. And that work was undertaken by you on your own initiative?

Capt. BASHURE. In one way, yes; as part of my duties as adjutant.

Mr. VAILE. You had general instructions from The Adjutant General's Office to be on the lookout for places to place these men?

Capt. BASHURE. No; I can't say that I did. I received these questionnaires and asked for an expression of opinion without prejudice from the men either one way or the other. I explained what the situation was, and I asked, in view of that explanation, what they wanted to do.

Mr. BENHAM. Do you happen to know, Captain, whether there was any general attempt by the military authorities to interrogate men in the Army as to their feeling in regard to this project?

Capt. BASHURE. I only know as to my own garrison. I don't even know as to Camp Shelby, just below us. The remount is a separate post.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What proportion of the soldiers, Captain, that you interrogated had been overseas?

Capt. BASHURE. Our men, none of them, had been overseas. They were all in the remount service. They were men put into the remount service because they had had clerical training, and some percentage of them—I don't know what percentage now—were farmer boys, and some were veterinarians. They were men skilled in the care of horses, a great many of them.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Most of them were recruits, I assume, from the agricultural districts?

Capt. BASHURE. Yes; three-fourths of the entire garrison of 700 men were drawn from Indiana, Kentucky, and West Virginia, 10 per cent from South Carolina, and the balance were scattering.

The CHAIRMAN. This was a voluntary canvass on your part?

Capt. BASHURE. Absolutely voluntary. They were sent the questionnaire and I took it upon myself to see just how the men stood.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. RAKER. Just for the sake of information, how did you get your questionnaires, Captain?

Capt. BASHURE. They were sent us through the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The War Department sent you down a whole bundle of them?

Capt. BASHURE. A whole bundle of them; yes. We were told to distribute them to the men.

Mr. RAKER. The purpose of that was to get an idea from the boys as to what they would like to do as soon as they got out of the Army?

Capt. BASHURE. That was the point exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It was the policy of the War Department to try to place men as they were demobilized in some useful occupation as quickly as possible? That is the general policy of the War Department?

Capt. BASHURE. Yes; that is the idea. Of course, that was entirely independent of this, because they realized that it would take some time to put this into operation.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Captain.

Gentlemen of the committee, it is evident that we can not complete to-day. Mr. Drane wants to go on and we still have Director Davis, and Mr. Atkeson tells me that it would be just as convenient for him to come Monday. What is the further wish of the committee about sitting longer?

Mr. RAKER. Can't we take a recess until Monday at 10 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will take a recess until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 1 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, June 9, 1919.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
Monday, June 9, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

**STATEMENT OF MR. E. PHILIP ROSENTHAL, OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
REPRESENTING THE HUMAN WELFARE ASSOCIATION.**

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I believe I have something very important to tell you. I have been working on this proposition for 30 years, and I have come here especially from Washington and Oregon to lay before you this proposition. This is a proposition that has been indorsed by the Sixty-third Conference of the Methodist Church, by the Parent Teachers' Association, and by the State Federation of Labor. I have here a proposition that is far superior, aye, ten thousand times superior, to the one you have before you. This is a proposition that will benefit all of the soldiers and all of the people, and the proposition is one that is very vital. Now, I have something important to say to you, and I want to take the time to say it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you complete your statement in 15 minutes?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If you decide at the end of 15 minutes that I have said nothing worth while, then I can stop.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you start in for 15 minutes. First tell the committee whom you are and whom you represent.

Mr. FERRIS. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this ought to be in the form of a specific amendment to this bill? Whatever you have ought to be in the form of specific amendment to the bill that we are endeavoring to perfect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you something prepared in specific or concrete form?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; I have something specifically prepared, but, not being a lawyer, I do not think I am capable of making an amendment to your bill that will pass muster.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are capable of reducing your important ideas to writing, are you not?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; and I have them here in writing.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

**THE SELF-HELP PLAN: A PROGRAM OF RECONSTRUCTION SOLVING THE PROBLEM OF
UNEMPLOYMENT THE AMERICAN WAY.**

Placing education as the foundation of the plan, and recognizing the spirit of the new democracy as expressed in the self-evident truth that every human being is endowed with the inalienable right to the ownership of a job, giving him access to the means to satisfy the demands of life, developing in the person an independence such as every lover of liberty should possess, and places the person on equal footing with every other person as to opportunity in the race for the pursuit of happiness.

A BILL To establish in the Federal Board for Vocational Education a Bureau of Self-Help Education, making appropriation for its support and for other purposes.

[Proposed by the Self-Help Plan Society.]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled; That there is established in the Federal Board for Vocational Education a division to be known as the Division of Self-Help, the director of which shall receive a salary at the rate of \$8,000 per annum.

That there be in such division a section of farm workshop education and a section of self-help community in charge of a superintendent of education and a superintendent of communities, each of whom shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum.

That this act be known as Self-Help Act and that the word "board" hereinafter used in this act shall mean the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the word "establishment" shall mean farm workshop schools and the word "community" shall mean self-help community. That the word "director" shall mean the director of the self-help division of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

SEC. 2. That the director, subject to the general direction of the board, shall administer, execute, and enforce the provisions of this act, and for that purpose have full power and authority to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, necessary or appropriate to carry out its purposes, and shall decide all questions arising under the act. Wherever under any provision or provisions of the act regulations are directed or authorized to be made, such regulations, unless the context otherwise requires, shall or may be made by the director, subject to the general direction of the board.

SEC. 3. That the director in cooperation with States, counties, cities, and any other agencies shall through the section of farm workshop education establish on the public domain national forests, State lands, or any other lands that may be required, farm workshop schools. These schools shall teach the science of farming and other necessary trades and professions which supply the means to satisfy the needs of life by practical creative work. Such labor shall be utilized as far as possible in producing and manufacturing the food, clothing, shelter, tools, materials, and equipments necessary for the maintenance of said establishments. Such establishments shall be open to persons of all ages and of both sexes, either as individuals or as family units.

The director when necessary shall provide the means to bring the prospective students to the establishments. The director shall maintain an employment service as a branch of the establishment for the placement of students.

SEC. 4. That the director in cooperation with States, counties, cities, and any other agencies shall through the section of self-help community establish on the public domain national forests, State lands or any other lands that may be required, farm workshop villages.

The director shall select those from the students attending the establishment who have proved themselves capable and worthy, group them harmoniously according to their respective vocation, locate them in the self-help colony—a farm workshop village laid out on a definite plan by an expert on community settlement—back these groups with land for farming and other purposes, implements, tools, stock, buildings, and other equipment necessary for the successful pursuit of their vocation on a system of credit to be determined by the board, and during the period of such a credit the director shall, as the agent of the student draftsmen, supervise the sales and the marketing of their products and purchase their supplies. And for this purpose the director is authorized to business agents and to establish the necessary warehouses, exchanges, and stores.

The director shall allot as much land as in the board's discretion may be required for the support of such allottee and his dependents. Such allotment shall be made only for the period of actual and continuous occupancy and beneficial use by such allottee, but the improvements on the land and the right of occupancy and use may be sold or otherwise shall pass by descent in like manner as real estate.

The director shall plan the farm workshop village in such manner that there shall be produced from the various workshops thereon, as far as is possible, all the supplies that are needed to meet the requirements of the farm workshop villages and producing a surplus of the products of the predominating industry

of the community which is governed by the natural resources of the community. The surplus to be exchanged with other communities.

The director shall establish in each farm village a community house to be the center of the social activities of the community.

SEC. 5. That the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw from entry under existing land laws, from time to time as much of the public domain as shall in his judgment be requisite for the carrying out of the provisions of this act. When so withdrawn, such lands shall be subject to disposition under the provisions of this act, and where necessary additional lands not already publicly owned may be acquired.

SEC. 6. That it shall be the duty of the board to make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports with particular reference to their use in aiding in the cooperation with the States, counties, cities, and other agencies in the establishment of the farm workshop schools and self-help colonies. When the board deems it advisable, such studies, investigations and reports may be made in cooperation with or through other departments and bureaus of the Government, and the board in its discretion may cooperate with any bureau, department, State board, and with such other public or private agencies as it may deem advisable in performing the duties imposed upon it by this act.

The board shall have the power to cooperate with States, counties, cities, or any other agencies in carrying out the provisions of this act on the plan which the board is carrying out the provisions of the previous acts. The board shall also have the power to adopt another plan or plans which will be more suitable to fulfill the purpose of this act.

SEC. 7. That the board is hereby authorized and empowered to receive such gifts and donations from either public or private sources as may be offered unconditionally. All moneys received as gifts or donations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and shall constitute a permanent fund, to be called the "Special Self-Help Fund," to be used, in the discretion of the said board, in connection with the appropriation hereby made or hereafter to be made, to promote and maintain the aforesaid establishments; and a full report of all gifts and donations offered and accepted, and all disbursements therefrom, shall be submitted annually to Congress by said board.

SEC. 8. For carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June, 1920, the sum of \$5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June, 1921, the sum of \$10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June, 1922, \$20,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June, 1923, \$30,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June, 1924, \$40,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June, 1925, \$50,000,000. The board is hereby authorized to so proportion the funds to the various branches of this work on a plan that will best serve the purpose of this act.

SEC. 9. All moneys appropriated by this act, excepting that portion used by the board to acquire land, shall be refunded to the Government with interest from the earnings of the student-workmen on a plan to be formulated by the board.

SEC. 10. The said board shall file with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate on July 1, 1920, and every three months thereafter, for the information of Congress, an itemized account of all expenditures made under this act, including names and salaries of employees. Said board shall also make an annual report to Congress of its doings under this act on or before December 1 of each year.

SEC. 11. The board is hereby granted authority to reorganize and readjust the work of any of its divisions and offices, to employ instructors, supervisors, clerks, and any other assistants, and to take any further action that may be deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect immediately upon its passage and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. My name is E. Philip Rosenthal, and I was born in Russia. I came here to this country because American ideals appealed to me. I am not in favor of this plan for many reasons.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where do you live and where have you been living?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have lived for 15 years in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is your business there?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. My business is lecturing.

Mr. TAYLOR. On what subjects?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. On these particular ideas, or on human welfare.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you been lecturing in just one place?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; all over Oregon and California.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the subject of human welfare?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. Do you belong to any organization?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have talked to many organizations.

Mr. FERRIS. What organizations do you represent in your lectures?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I represented the Human Welfare Organization, which has branches in Oregon, Washington, and California.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you convinced the people in the chairman's home city on this subject?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think that before I am through I will convince you gentlemen right here.

Mr. BARBOUR. What is the name of this organization you represent?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I said I represented the Human Welfare Organization.

Mr. BARBOUR. I thought you said a human welfare organization.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. The organization has funds for this purpose?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No; there were just some contributions made. The mayor of the town and the chamber of commerce paid my expenses in coming here. I refer to the mayor of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you represent them here?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I represent this idea. We had a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, and they got together \$200. One man put in \$100 and the rest gave \$100, and with that money I came here.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that we give this gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. BENHAM. I suggest that we give this gentleman sufficient time to present his views.

The CHAIRMAN. You have 15 minutes, and you may proceed with your statement.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am not in favor of this plan, first, for the reason that this plan is un-American. The American ideal is 100 per cent ideal, and wherever we start in we should say "all." We say that all men are born free and equal, and that all men have the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The American ideal is all ideal, and whenever there is a proposition that does not take in all of the people, then that proposition is un-American, and I am against it.

Even if the proposition takes in 99 per cent of the people and leaves out only 1 per cent, it is un-American in principle, and I am opposed to it. The proposition of the American ideal is much broader than what is claimed by some people. It is not the greatest good for the greatest number, but it is the greatest good for all. It is such that not one can be left out. The proposition of an autocracy is the proposition that the King is the only one having rights, and that all the rest are his subjects; the proposition of the autocracy is that the King is the only one that has inalienable rights, and that the others have such

rights as he gives them. This proposition takes in 2 per cent of the soldiers, and, therefore, is not a 100 per cent proposition. For that reason I am opposed to it, because I want a 100 per cent proposition. That is one objection.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "100 per cent" do you mean 100 per cent of the soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I say that you should put them all in, because if you include 100 per cent of the soldiers it will be reflected so as to benefit all of the people. If you do something for 100 per cent of the soldiers it will be reflected in benefits to all the people. You will be doing something for the soldiers, and it should be something for 100 per cent of the soldiers.

Then, another objection which I have to this proposition is that it is misleading. It is not what it purports to be.

Mr. FERRIS. Will you let me understand, first, exactly what your proposition No. 1 is? Do you mean by making it 100 per cent to take in nonsoldiers as well as soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I mean to take in all the soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, if this offers an opportunity to all soldiers, does it not include all of them?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do I understand that this 15 minutes allotted me is to be taken up by you or by myself?

Mr. FERRIS. Please answer my question.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I mean that 100 per cent should take in all of the soldiers who want something done for them.

Mr. FERRIS. Then, it is your proposition to confine it to soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. But you want to take in all of the soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; and that, of course, will be reflected in benefits to the whole of the people. In this way you can do something for one man that will be reflected in benefits to others. If you do something for 100 per cent of the soldiers, that will be reflected in benefits to the whole of society. The whole of society will be benefited by it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you want to include the Spanish War and Civil War veterans?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Well, they have had something, and I do not know about that. The Civil War soldiers had their lands given to them, and I consider this a proposition for these returning soldiers.

Now, the next objection is that this proposition is misleading and is going under a false pretense. We are made to believe that this means a job for the man, but, in reality, it means a man formed for a job. This job is here, and you are looking for men to fit the job. Now, last night I was wondering about what this judge who had spoken here meant when he claimed that this was a reclamation project. I was lying in bed, and I said, "This is a problem for Solomon to decide." Then, all at once, I heard a voice say, "This is Solomon; what do you want?" I said, "Is that a proposition for reclamation or is it a proposition for soldiers?" The voice said, "Put it down and see how it fits." I did so, and saw that it fit 2 per cent. Then the voice said, "It is no fit at all. Anything that fits only 2 per cent is not fair to the soldiers."

The CHAIRMAN. Did you actually converse with Solomon?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That does not make any difference.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you actually converse with him, or was that merely a figure of speech?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It may have been a figure of speech, or, maybe I really had the conversation. That does not make any difference.

The third objection is that even this 2 per cent is not the beginning of the 100 per cent; that it is not 1 and 2 but that it is about 40 and 41. This picture of farms for soldiers looks to me like a second story on stilts. There is nobody who can reach it except a second-story man. This proposition requires that the soldiers should have at least \$500, and, besides that, he must have sufficient money to carry him through until he makes a crop. Now, it is absolutely impossible for any man or for any soldier who has nothing but his hands to make his living by going to work and taking his chances under this liberal offer. He is entirely cut out from this proposition.

Now, I have an article here by Elwood Mead, who is the father of this plan here. He was the consulting engineer, and he verifies my statement that the problem which they are trying to solve is not a soldier problem, but is the problem of the country—that is, that the farms are going to waste and that they must do something to reclaim the farm idea. It is only by a coincidence, and it is only a coincidence, that the soldier has appeared. Then, there was the demand that the soldier should fit that particular farm idea. Mr. Mead is the father of this proposition, and he specifically states that the soldier should be made to pay an installment of \$500 for the simple reason that if he does not pay the money he will not be apt to be a farmer, and, consequently, will drop the project and disappear. They are not trying to solve the problem of the soldier, but they are trying to make a success of particular colonies, it making no difference to them whether the soldier succeeds or not. It is not a soldier proposition, but it is simply an effort to make a success of the other proposition. I can leave you here a copy of Mr. Mead's article and you can read it for yourselves.

Then I have another article from Prof. Newell, who was chief of the Reclamation Service of this country, and he, too, attacks that plan upon the same particular idea that it is mixed—that is, that it is not a soldier proposition, but that it is a mixed proposition. Now, I do not say that Secretary Lane is in league with the land speculators, but I do say that Secretary Lane is at the head of the reclamation proposition. The Reclamation Service is in his department, and he wants to boost his department, just as any other man who is in charge of a particular service would do.

Mr. RAKER. Is Mr. Newell against this proposition?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Do you mean the Mr. Newell who was the Chief of the Reclamation Service?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; and who is now connected with the University of Illinois. I saw this article which was printed in the Vocational Summary.

The CHAIRMAN. When did it appear?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. About three or four months ago.

Mr. ELSTON. You do not mean that Mr. Newell is against it, but you simply imply that the arguments he uses would support your theory?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; he is against the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you read this bill before the committee and the other bill by Secretary Lane?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir. He wrote something about the idea that was brought forth, or when it was brewing. Now, there is another thing I want to tell you, which may or may not be a secret, and that is that the Department of Labor is not in favor of this proposition. The Department of Labor at the last session of Congress did all they could to defeat this proposition. They went to work, or tried to go to work, to get somebody—I do not know who the Congressman was—to introduce some amendment to take the whole proposition out of the hands of Secretary Lane and put it into the hands of a commission.

Mr. RAKER. Who was that?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not know who introduced the bill. You can find that out yourself. You can get people down here.

Mr. ELSTON. A representative of the Department of Labor, speaking for the department and for the American Federation of Labor, explained that situation and said, notwithstanding that, that they were perfectly willing to adopt this plan, and they were unreservedly in favor of it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is all right. Now, I have here an article from Wallace's Farmer, which has just come this morning. This article in Wallace's Farmer says, "We have no wish to be unfair."

Mr. WHITE (interposing). Did you refer to the Federal Government's Department of Labor or to the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. To the Department of Labor. They are trying to get this proposition out of the hands of the Reclamation Service, and want to put it in the hands of a commission, which will be in charge of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RAKER. They are in favor of this proposition, and the only difference is that they want to handle it instead of letting the Secretary of the Interior handle it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; that is it. Now, here is an article in Wallace's Farmer, which came this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. What date is that?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. May 23. This article says:

We have no wish to be unfair, but this whole scheme would seem to be far more in the interest of owners of desert and swamp lands and the communities round about than in the interests of the soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you reading all of the article?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir. The article continues:

Why would it not be a good thing to take the whole matter out of the hands of Secretary Lane? Why should the Department of the Interior meddle with farm lands at all? If anything along this line should be done by the Government, the Department of Agriculture is the Department through which it ought to go. The people there certainly know as much about farming as the Department of the Interior, and are far better informed concerning agricultural conditions generally. In addition, that department has an organization which can be of real help to the inexperienced farmer.

Mr. RAKER. There is only a difference between them as to whether it should be under the Department of Agriculture, under the Department of Labor, or under the Department of the Interior. Where do you think it ought to go?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will give you my plan. Now, Secretary Lane himself has indorsed this particular proposition of mine. I told him about it, and I talked this proposition of mine over with him. He inferred that my proposition was too big for Congress. He said, "It does not require any more money, but the idea is too big." I myself believe that you are big men and that you can comprehend big ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made that remark?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Lane did not use those particular words, but he inferred to me that Congress was ready to do good work and to do popular things, but was not ready to do big things. That, of course, is the proposition. The Secretary himself has indorsed this, and gave me a written statement indorsing this particular plan or idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Your plan?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not reciprocate with the Secretary and indorse his plan?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would indorse his plan if he would make it include 98 per cent more.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you indorse it as far as it goes?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I do not, because it lacks the beginning. It is all in the middle.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not indorse it as far as it goes?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; not at all; absolutely not, because it is un-American.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not indorse it as a step in the right direction?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No sir; it is not a step, but it is a second story. You must have a basement and first story before you can reach it. As it is, you must have a flying machine in order to get up there. I can not indorse that particular proposition. Now, the whole situation is this: The whole world is afire just at the present time; the world is crumbling and there is a great problem for somebody to solve. I believe that the American Congress can find the solution.

Mr. RAKER. I did not quite get your idea that the world was crumbling.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; it is crumbling. When men are fighting one another, when men are running bayonets through other men's bodies, when men are murdering other men, and when men are grabbing other men by the throat, I say the world is crumbling. Do you want anything more than that? Civilization is crumbling.

The CHAIRMAN. You are dealing with a lot of generalities and we have before us a specific proposition. Your time is running rapidly, but we do not want to curtail you.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I say that the American Congress has got the solution of this problem. Now, the solution of this problem is this: My proposition is that the Board for Vocational Education is dealing with men, while the Reclamation Service is dealing with lands. The Reclamation Service is dealing with the land proposition. Now, I want to have a division in the Federal Board for Vocational Education, under the Federal Board for Vocational Education, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Education. I want those representatives of those three departments, and I want a division in there to carry out this proposition.

I would add to that a school where everybody could come and learn the science of farming and the science of every trade that is necessary in the pursuit of a vocation. I would not only take in the farmer, but I would take in the whole mass of soldiers; not only those who want to farm, but those who want to be blacksmiths, those who want to be engineers, or those who want to be jewelers, or those who want to be anything else by which they can make a living. I would take in the whole scope of industrial education. I want every student to learn how to do things, and after the student has become proficient in his vocation to back him up in that particular vocation, either on the farm or in some other trade. It would include every line of industry in which they would want to engage. There is absolutely no reason why this Government should back up men as farmers and not back them up in other lines of industry. Why not back him up in a carpenter shop or a blacksmith shop or any other shop? There is no reason why Congress should back up a man on a farm and not back up a man who can make beautiful things in silver and gold; there is no reason why a man should be backed up on a farm and should not be backed up in any other kind of industry.

If we do something for the farmers—and we have no lands any more—we must spend \$500,000,000 in procuring lands. If it is a question of backing the soldier, then let us make this a soldier proposition and back every soldier. Then the proposition will take in all these other men. I say that because I want the school to be a productive school, where the student who comes in may produce while he learns, and the things that he produces will feed him and support him while at school. It will not be any expense at all. There is a beautiful idea embodied in this workshop. We will say to the soldier, "Do you want to be helped?" The soldier would say, "I do not know what to do." We would say to him, "Would you like to learn the carpenters' trade, would you like to learn the cabinetmakers' trade, the jewelers' trade, or would you like to be a fireman or a brakeman? We will instruct you in anything you want to learn. We will give you work and give you a chance." We could say to him, "The Government of the United States is willing to back up every soldier and will do everything for the soldier in the way of teaching him to do useful things." Then, after the soldier has learned how to do things, we ought to go to work and say to him, "Look here, the Government is liberal, and we will back you up. Do you want to start in the cabinetmaker's business, do you want to start in the blacksmith business, or in some other business? If you do, we will back you up." The only difference between this plan and the other plan is that under this plan which I propose the Reclamation Service goes to work in cooperation with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and we start a school there. We do not pay wages to those who go to school, but we make them productive while they are learning, so that they may pay their own expenses.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you reduced your plan to writing?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have, but it is not in proper shape for a bill. It is ungrammatical, or it is not worded in the proper form. I am not a lawyer, but you can get the drafting machinery which Congress has provided to put it in proper shape. Then you will have a 100 per cent plan. When you put something in that will benefit 2,000,000

soldiers you will not benefit all of them. Now, there is a great problem of unemployment. I think it is far better that the labor market should be short than that one man should go around in this country hungry and unable to find a job. It is far better that the capitalist should not find people to work for him than it is for one man to go around hungry and naked. We are a rich country and can feed the world. We can solve the unemployment problem here, and when we have done that we will have solved every other problem. We will have solved the problem of capital and labor; we will have solved the problem of child labor; and we will have solved every other industrial problem.

In New York there was a report that a majority of the children in a school district went to school hungry. Think of it! Think of children in America going to school hungry, while Congress sits here and does not provide a plan by which the fathers of those children can get work and be able to feed their children! On the child-labor problem Congress has enacted two laws, and both of them were unconstitutional, but if you will provide a plan by which the fathers of the children can get jobs so that they can feed their children and not send them to school hungry no judge can make that law unconstitutional. Then you will have solved the child-labor problem. Now, under the plan you have here \$500,000,000 are demanded of you. Suppose you go to work and use that \$500,000,000 under this plan of Secretary Lane's, and it will benefit only 2 per cent of the soldiers; but if you will enlarge it so as to include 100 per cent of the soldiers, then you will have solved this American problem in an American way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that the jurisdiction of this committee pertains only to the lands of the Government, and that it has no jurisdiction over many of the matters that you have been speaking of? Have you taken these other features up with any other committees that have jurisdiction of them?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I come before this committee because this whole proposition is based on lands. If this committee has not the jurisdiction, then it is your business to go to work and call in the other committees. If I give you something that it is worth while, then you should go to work and fix it up in proper form. If I say something that you think is foolish, then, of course, you should not pay any attention to it.

Mr. ELSTON. Do you want your proposed bill inserted as a part of your remarks?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.

Mr. FERRIS. I would like to have his proposed bill or plan to precede his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done.

Mr. JOHNSON. You said that you were born in Europe. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Over 30 years.

Mr. JOHNSON. You have been naturalized?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; I was naturalized just as soon as I could be. Just as soon as God let me, I became a naturalized citizen. I will tell you right now that I have done some work in this country

for the benefit of America, and I have also pushed the question of industrial education. I helped to make this Federal Board for Vocational Education. In the solution of the American problems, the Federal Board for Vocational Education and every man in this country should go to work and try to do things. It is said that the industries in this country are only 25 per cent efficient. These industrial colonies or soldiers' colonies should be made models for helping the Federal Board for Vocational Education to bring up the efficiency all over this country. Now, just imagine what would happen in this country when manufacturing concerns could increase their production 400 per cent. To-day it is only 25 per cent efficient. In the first place, they could pay four times the wage they are now paying.

MR. JOHNSON. During the 30 years you have been in this country, what has been your business or vocation?

MR. ROSENTHAL. I organized the Industrial Art League, which is promoting industrial education in this country, and I will give you the names of some of the people who have worked with me: Mr. Lowden, who is now governor of Illinois; Dr. W. R. Harper, the late president of the University of Chicago—

MR. SMITH. He has been dead about 10 years.

MR. ROSENTHAL. I said 30 years ago. Then, there was Dr. George E. Vincent, now president of the Rockefeller Foundation; Francis W. Parker, principal of the Chicago Normal School and founder of the Francis W. Parker School; Prof. George N. Carmen, director of the Lewis Institute; Prof. Gabriel Bomberger, head of the Jewish Manual Training School; Dr. Henry Wade Rogers, Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews, and other leading educators. I have been working trying to improve the condition of America in an educational way.

MR. JOHNSON. Do you represent organized labor?

MR. ROSENTHAL. Well, no.

MR. JOHNSON. You said a while ago that organized labor was against this bill.

MR. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I did not say that. I said the Department of Labor was against it.

MR. JOHNSON. You do not represent organized labor?

MR. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; but I told you that the State federation of labor indorsed my plan. I have taken this proposition up with the State Federation of Labor of Oregon, and they have indorsed it. I have taken it up with churches, and they have indorsed it. There is no opposition to it. You are not opposed to it; you can not be opposed to it, because who is opposed to seeing that everybody should eat and be able to work? Nobody can be opposed to that.

THE CHAIRMAN. Have you been cooperating in the work of the Federal Board for Vocational Education?

MR. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; the Federal Board for Vocational Education was not exactly the idea that we worked for.

THE CHAIRMAN. I mean, have you been cooperating with them in their work?

MR. ROSENTHAL. No, sir. I pushed it and I educated for the Federal Board for Vocational Education, but the Federal Board for Vocational Education has gotten out from the hands of educators

and has gotten into the hands of business. They are using the Federal Board of Vocational Education as a means for making men for machines. My idea is for men—that is, to make the shop for the man and not make the man for the shop. We are doing things in this country that are the reverse of that. What we want to do is to make the man first, and upon him to build the country.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had 35 minutes. Does any member of the committee wish to ask Mr. Rosenthal any questions?

Mr. SMITH. Do you think it is necessary to send men to school to make of them carpenters, blacksmiths, machinists, etc., instead of letting them learn those trades, as they are now learned to a large extent, by associating them with those who are engaged in those occupations?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. These schools ought to be for the people, and there they should be trained.

Mr. SMITH. Is it intended that these people in training should not be compensated?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They should have the opportunity to learn until they become proficient in their vocations.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think that would be attractive to the soldier?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir. The idea is not for him to go to school long. If he was in school two months—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). You could not teach a man a trade in two months.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. He would be a soldier, and the question of whether he should be paid while learning is a detail.

Mr. SMITH. Is not your proposition a burden upon the Government?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; because they could pay back the money.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate as the cost of this scheme?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. For the proposition there, about \$100,000,000—\$5,000,000 the first year, \$10,000,000 the next year, and \$20,000,000 thereafter. It might run for five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that that will take care of the lands for soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And of the vocational education and everything of that kind?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much will that aggregate, or what would be the total cost of it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The total cost would be about \$100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. How many farms would you secure, and at what price?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Those farms could be small.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the size of one of your farms?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. These farms would be about 20 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would they be located?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. In what States would you have those farms?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In all the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, in what particular States would you have 20-acre farms?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would have them in our State of Oregon. We could have 20-acre farms in Oregon. Here is what I would do, and I will show you a picture of that community. Here is a community or settlement with farms and shops intermingled. These farms are intensive farms.

The CHAIRMAN. What would the land on your 20-acre farm cost?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you advising this committee on a matter on which you have no idea of the cost involved?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I had some idea about two years ago, but now, as you know, lands are three times as high.

The CHAIRMAN. You have just come from Oregon. What could you buy these farms for there?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have not investigated lands there lately.

The CHAIRMAN. You are advising this committee on an important subject.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do you know that Secretary Lane has \$200,000 to be used in bringing that information to you. I have not exact information on that, but I am bringing to you a plan.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion of land values in Oregon? Take eastern Oregon, for instance, and state what, in your opinion, you would have to pay for a 20-acre farm.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Col. Good, who bought a tract for a French concern there, bought some for \$20 per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was that?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In eastern Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. Where in eastern Oregon? In Malheur County?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in Coos County, too?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think in Coos County, also.

The CHAIRMAN. Coos County is not an eastern county, but it is one of the Pacific coast counties.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. There are three tracts. There is the Handley tract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Handley tract is the "P" Ranch in Harney County. It is a cattle ranch containing 150,000 acres. What could you get that for?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I could have gotten it four or five years ago for \$20 per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been on the "P" Ranch?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not know that the "P" Ranch is at an elevation of nearly 4,000 feet, where they have frost nearly every month in the year, and do you not know that it is in an arid section where, in order to make a living on a 20-acre farm, the land would have to be irrigated? What would it cost to irrigate it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have not the figures. You could get those figures from the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what a 20-acre farm in that section would produce? If you put a man on a 20-acre farm out there, don't you know that it would be impossible for him to make a living? Don't you know that it would be impossible for a man to make a living in eastern Oregon on a 20-acre farm, unless you placed him

at the lower altitudes where he could engage in truck or orchard farming, as, for instance, in the Hood River section?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. There are some 20-acre farms in Oregon. I know of school boys making \$600 on a garden right in the city of Portland.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you pay for a 20-acre tract in the city of Portland?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. There are lots of tracts being sold at \$20 per acre within 10 miles of Portland.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be \$400.

Mr. RAKER. Where is this land?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. At Portland, Oreg.

Mr. RAKER. At \$20 per acre?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; that was four years ago, but not now. You can take Secretary Lane's figures.

Mr. SNELL. Were you connected with any other business except this agitation business—

Mr. ROSENTHAL (interposing). I am not an agitator.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is the word you yourself used.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir.

Mr. WHITE. I want to ask you whether it is your idea that the students in these various industries in which they are to be instructed shall pay the Government the expense of their education subsequently?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; everything shall be repaid.

Mr. WHITE. In cash?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. From earnings. Of course there are some details I have not worked out, and there are a lot of questions to be decided. We ought to do something for the soldier who does not want to be a farmer and who is not fit to be a farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you pay per acre for land in the truck-farming section of Oregon?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I do not know. I would like to take Secretary Lane's proposition there and add to it these schools or workshops, and let the Federal Board for Vocational Education—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have been dealing with a lot of glittering generalities, and I would like to have your views on some practical phases of the matter. How many farms would you purchase for the soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would purchase just as many farms as there are soldiers who want farms.

The CHAIRMAN. How many are there?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would have to get those figures.

The CHAIRMAN. Assume that there are 4,000,000 soldiers and that one-half of them want to be farmers: Then you would purchase 2,000,000 farms, would you not?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It does not make any difference; yes, sir. What is the difference? What difference does it make what we pay if the soldier pays it back?

The CHAIRMAN. What is your idea, then, as to how much we should provide?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is for the committee. You are going to work investigating here, and you have given the Secretary \$200,000 so as to enable him to come before you and bring you the details.

Now, you want me, a poor man, to come here and bring you the details. The idea is my business. I am not an engineer, but my specialty is education. I give you the idea, and you have got the machinery here for making it practical.

Mr. BARBOUR. You say that your proposition has the indorsement of several organizations, including some churches?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. Have you talked to any soldiers' organization upon this subject?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. What organization?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. With soldiers.

Mr. BARBOUR. With individual soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. You have talked with how many of them?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Probably with 50 or 60.

Mr. BARBOUR. What do they think about it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They think it is fine and beautiful.

Mr. BARBOUR. I mean this Mondell bill?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They say that it is all right if a man wants to be a farmer; but some of them said, "I do not want to farm." You are trying to do something to fit the soldier to the farms. This is something that should be done for the soldiers, and I want you to do something for the machinist, for the carpenter, and for all of the soldiers who are here asking for help. It was not the farmer alone who fought, but the machinists, carpenters, and laboring men also fought, and they want to be appreciated in this beneficent undertaking.

Mr. RAKER. You are in favor of providing homesteads for those soldiers who desire them?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Provided you provide for the others, too.

Mr. RAKER. Will you not answer my question? Are you in favor of providing homesteads according to the methods provided in this bill for the soldiers who desire to take advantage of them and make homes upon the land?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You are against that?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am against it unless you provide for the others.

Mr. RAKER. You are against providing homes for any soldiers?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes; if you do not at the same time provide for the carpenters and blacksmiths.

Mr. RAKER. You understand my question?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; I do, perfectly.

Mr. RAKER. Let us start back again. Are you in favor of the purposes of this bill to provide homes for soldiers who desire to go on the land and farm?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am in favor of providing jobs for the soldiers, and they will get their own homes. I want to provide for the soldier who wants to be a blacksmith, carpenter, or jeweler, or who wants to follow any of the other trades. I am not in favor of any special privileges to anybody. I am an American citizen, and believe in affording equal opportunity to all.

Mr. RAKER. Do you think that the Government should take charge of these soldiers and look after them from now on?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Either all of them or none of them.

Mr. RAKER. Let us get the question first. Let us understand what the question is, and do not answer something else. In that way we will save time. You are in favor of the Government taking charge of these soldiers and providing work for them and caring for them from now on until their death?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I am in favor of the American principle of equal opportunity to all, and I am in favor of having this Government to give the American soldier who went to the war a fair opportunity. That is all. I am in favor of this country giving the soldier an opportunity, and of giving all the soldiers an opportunity—not simply 2 per cent of the soldiers, but 100 per cent of them.

Mr. RAKER. In furnishing these soldiers with homesteads, do you think the Government should permit them to sell them after they have made the proper payments? After the soldier has made all proper payments, do you think he should have the right to sell it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is another matter entirely, and I can not go into that proposition. I am not talking about single tax, and I do not want to bring that in.

Mr. RAKER. I am not talking about single tax, but I am talking about this bill.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; I am in favor of affording the soldier an opportunity to own the land, so that no land speculator shall come along and grab it away from him.

Mr. RAKER. Do you think this Government should change its policy of permitting a man to own real estate in fee, and that the Government should own the land and keep charge of it and let the soldier use it for a time?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That is your theory?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. All right. Now, if you should locate these soldiers upon homesteads, you would want them located in separate homes?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; in communities.

Mr. RAKER. Let me get through with my question. We will make much better progress if you will simply answer my questions, and then you can dilate upon them afterwards as fully as you like. Are you in favor of the method of farming in this country whereby the soldier settler would have an individual farm, or are you in favor of a community center where they would live in a town and farm their land from that center?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am in favor of every soldier having his own farm entirely, but at the same time I would keep the community. They would have the churches, schools, workshops, stores, etc., together.

Mr. RAKER. They would have the workshops, schools, churches, etc., together, and then the soldier who owned his farm would work his farm from that community center?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; he would live right on his farm. He could live right on his farm, and he does not have to live somewhere else. He would still have the community.

Mr. RAKER. Would you have the farm at the community center?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir. Suppose they had 100 farms and about 40 workshops intermingled with the churches, school houses, etc.,

and the community center. That would be a building, and they could all come to the community center. Then they would not be hindered as they are now, and they would be very much more closely associated.

Mr. RAKER. Where?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Under this community plan.

Mr. RAKER. In what way are farmers hindered now? Do you mean that they are hindered because the individual farms are separated by a distance of a mile and a half from other places?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They have not the community sociability.

Mr. RAKER. What I am trying to get at is whether, fundamentally, you are trying to advocate to this committee that there should be a community place or center where they should live and have their workshops, churches, moving picture shows, etc., all of it forming a sort of community?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You are giving a wrong interpretation of the word "community." The man would live on his farm, and the place where the public buildings are located will be the center, with every farmer having about the same distance to go in order to reach the community center. Where there is a community center there is the elevator, schoolhouse, church, etc. Those things make up the community.

Mr. RAKER. I understand that you have crossed the continent from Portland, Oreg., to tell the committee that this bill should not pass?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I came here from Portland, Oreg., to tell this committee that any legislation which is not marked for the American people is a stab at the American Government.

Mr. RAKER. Then, in your opinion, this bill, if enacted into law, would be a stab at the American Government?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; it would be class legislation.

Mr. RAKER. It would be vicious legislation, to your mind?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; class legislation. It is just as bad for Congressmen to get away from American principles in legislation as it is for Socialists to get away from American principles. That is what I came to tell the committee.

Mr. SMITH. The gist of your whole argument is that the activities of the Federal Board of Vocational Education should be extended so as to enable them to educate all the people?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Do you suppose that a very large percentage of the soldiers want to go to school?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir; a number of them want the opportunity. Here is a large unemployment problem. Here is a soldier who is peddling because he has got to do something. He can not do anything because he does not know how.

Mr. SMITH. If you do not pay them, do you think many of them would enter?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. They will when you get this scheme started. The proposition is to get work, or to give the soldiers something to do, because they have nothing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Are many of them idle?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Quite a number.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to make this suggestion: Does not the gentleman know that from all the industries of this country and from all the farms of the United States there is a cry for laborers at the present time?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. That demand is constantly coming up from every direction.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. We hear nothing else from the West but the cry for labor.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In the West they want men, and they will pay them \$100 per month for two months' work. It costs \$200 to go there, and the labor does not go because it can not get a steady job.

Mr. WHITE. That is partially true; but on the farms in the West, through all the Middle States, and in the great Central States there is a demand for labor at remunerative wages the year around. Those wages include board and lodging, and those men are better off than workingmen in the city. I do not care to open up that great question, but a great deal of the discussion of this labor question indicates a lack of knowledge of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you claim that the chamber of commerce of the city of Portland, Oreg., is against this Mondell bill, and that you have been sent here to represent the chamber of commerce in opposition to it?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir; I did not make any claim like that. When I said the chamber of commerce, I meant the people there at the chamber of commerce. They clubbed in together and gave me \$200, and blessed me to go on my way.

The CHAIRMAN. They have a special fund?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. These were private people.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you do not represent the chamber of commerce?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. No, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT J. DRANE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand, Mr. Drane, that Members of Congress are limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. DRANE. It is not really necessary for me to appear before the committee at all, except to place my State on record, and I think it is my duty to do that. I have not had the pleasure of reading the bill introduced by Representative Mondell, and I only know of it in the broad and general principles underlying it. Now, just to give you a very brief history, and you will then understand what I am driving at: When the so-called Lane bill was first formulated, and I mean before it was introduced, away last fall, the legislature of my State happened to be in extraordinary session at that time. Secretary Lane was invited by the legislature to appear before a joint session of the legislature at Tallahassee to explain just what his bill was. He knew that it was an extraordinary session of the legislature; he did not know how long it would last, but he knew it would only last for a few days at best. So he sent for me to ask me some ques-

tions as to the feasibility of getting there in time to address the legislature.

At that time he discussed his bill with me only in a very general way, inviting my attention to it. I told the Secretary that it would be impossible for him to get to Tallahassee even on the invitation of the legislature, because it was going to adjourn within about three days. He could not get there, and I asked him what he desired to do, or what was his particular reason for wanting to go. He said that his object in wanting to go to talk to the Florida Legislature was that Florida might place itself in a position, if it so desired or considered it wise, to cooperate with the United States Government in the interest of this bill, provided the bill should pass. I said, "Mr. Secretary, that is easily done in a much simpler and less expensive way than you have proposed. I will undertake to get a bill passed by the Florida Legislature within two days which will enable Florida to participate in cooperation with the Federal Government." I did not know what I could do, but I was willing to try. I sent a telegram to the president of the senate and the speaker of the house in Florida, calling attention to Secretary Lane's plan, which, I understand, as I have said before, is the general plan under discussion now. The Florida Legislature passed a bill which became a law within two or three days, the substance of which was this: That the land board—we have a board in Florida in which all the public lands are vested—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). State lands?

Mr. DRANE. State lands derived from the Government. They are so-called swamp and overflowed lands, but the swamp and overflowed lands under the law do not mean lands that are really swamp and overflowed lands. I live on some swamp and overflowed land myself, which is about on the same elevation as the dome of the Capitol at Washington. We class as swamp and overflowed land, lands that are much higher than the land on which we stand now. This bill simply provides that the land board shall have carte blanche to do anything it desires to do in so far as it will cooperate with the Federal Government in any bill involving the principle laid down in the bills that are under discussion. Then this bill which passed the legislature also provided that the governor should appoint a committee of well known citizens of his own choosing, who should cooperate with the Government in the event of any discussion coming up as to privately owned lands in large bodies. That committee was appointed. I regret that I do not remember the names of the members, but I remember seeing them, and they are gentlemen of distinguished standing in the State.

Mr. SUMMERS. The names are published here in the hearing.

Mr. DRANE. Yes; I see here that what I am now saying to you is already contained in your hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very brief statement there.

Mr. DRANE. Going just a little further before I consume my 15 minutes, Florida has practically every class of land under the sun, and it grows practically everything that is grown or that is suitable to the southern climate. It produces corn, hay, oats, and other crops, but it does not grow wheat. It produces the citrus and semicitrus fruits, and it grows every vegetable that is known to mankind. It has lands for corn, lands for fruit, lands for truck, and it has lands for

general farming, and selections have been made, as I understand it, of lands to be offered, but not privately owned lands. I know of no privately owned lands that are ready to be offered, although I assume that they will be. The lands that have been selected are State lands. They are not cut-over lands, but they are virgin timber lands, prairie lands, virgin swamp lands, etc., all of which are subject to or at the disposal of the Government upon any terms which are reasonable and which can be agreed upon as equitable and just as between the State land board and the Federal authorities. I simply want to say that my State is in hearty cooperation and sympathy with this movement, and is willing to cooperate in any bill which the wisdom of Congress may see fit to adopt. I think that covers about all that I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose that neither you nor the people of your State feel that this is a big scheme solely for the purpose of irrigating the arid lands of the West?

Mr. DRANE. I have never thought of it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The poison that has been sown among southern Members is that this is a big scheme to irrigate the arid lands of the West, and the poison is being sown among western Members that this is a big scheme to drain the swamp lands of the South. The poison is being sown among Senators and Representatives from the East that this is a big scheme on the part of both the West and the South to irrigate arid lands in the West and to drain swamp lands in the South. You take no stock in that, do you?

Mr. DRANE. My view of that is this, that we have an all-American Congress and that we have an all-American President. We have an all-American country. I believe—and God give them light to see it—that we are all working for a 100 per cent Americanism. I believe that we are trying to benefit the soldier who went across the seas to fight, in order to show that America is 100 per cent American. I do not care whether a Democrat should indorse or introduce this bill, or whether a Republican should indorse or introduce it; and I do not stop to inquire whether a soldier is a Democrat or a Republican. I will be glad to see the American soldier, if he wants to better his condition when he comes back into the paths of peace, to settle where it best suits him to settle, whether it be North, South, East, or West. Of course, I would rather see him settle in my State, which is the most cosmopolitan State in the Union. We have people there from all over the world. I should say, not from all over the world but from all over the United States, because, thank God, we have very few foreigners there.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that under this bill no scheme can be put over on the Government and no land taken over by the Government until its selection is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the particular State in which the land lies, and a member of the Federal reserve bank; and after it is approved by all three of them, it has to be approved by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and then by the House itself?

Mr. DRANE. You could not put any more safeguards around it if you tried. I do not look upon it as anything except what it shows on its face, that it is something for the benefit of the American soldier, with the love and affection of his Government behind it. That is all I see in it.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that your state is so deeply interested in this proposition that the State land board has been authorized to do whatever may seem proper in the way of cooperation, and that the State land board has indicated that they would turn over 200,000 acres of State land to the Government?

Mr. DRANE. I understand that by rumor. I have no official information, but I have no doubt that it is true.

Mr. NICHOLS. Can you say in what way this benefits the soldier? Give us your opinion of this proposition.

Mr. DRANE. If the soldier wants to farm, there is his opportunity; if he wants to get work, there is his opportunity. I understand the bill provides that he shall have good employment at a remunerative wage. I might say that, whether the bill passes or not, if 50,000 soldiers want to work on farms they can find them in Florida to-day.

Mr. WHITE. You do not think there is any prejudice in the minds of your people, your farmers, against this scheme out of consideration for the fact that it might increase the supply of farm products and thereby decrease their profits?

Mr. DRANE. No, sir; I should be ashamed to represent people like that.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad you bring that out.

Mr. DRANE. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we have with us Mr. Atkeson, of the National Grange or Patrons of Husbandry. He has been invited to appear before the committee on two matters.

Are you ready to be heard, Mr. Atkeson?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS C. ATKESON, OF BUFFALO, W. VA., REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY.

The CHAIRMAN. The first matter on which Mr. Atkeson has been invited to appear before the committee is the matter of some press notices that have been sent out and which many, on account of their tenor, assumed came from his organization.

You are familiar, Mr. Atkeson, with these press notices, are you?

Mr. ATKESON. I have one in my pocket.

The CHAIRMAN. I have three of them here. Now, these press notices are full of insinuations, innuendoes, and poison against the committee, intimating and directly alleging that Mr. Atkeson did not have a fair opportunity to be heard before the committee; that, in spite of the manifest antagonism, he was able to secure just 15 minutes before the committee to express the views of the National Grange.

If you are familiar with these notices, I wish you would state whether or not these press notices emanated from the grange.

Mr. ATKESON. I am glad to say emphatically that they did not, and until a copy drifted into my office, as they seem to have drifted into other people's offices, I knew nothing about it. This press notice professes to make some quotations from the statement I made. If those quotations are correct, I stand responsible for them; if not, I do not. I can not remember now, because my statement was purely

extemporaneous the other day, and it is impossible for me to remember the quotations from my statement. If anyone has a copy of the statement he can compare them. If they have quoted me correctly, I stand responsible for the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You stand responsible for what you have stated before?

Mr. ATKESON. Exactly; but for no other word or statement made in that circular. I do not know the motive; I do not know who sent it. I know nothing about it except that it seems to have emanated from some enterprising newspaper man.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know the origin of it?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir. It was not written or prepared in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 2 of one of them it says: "In spite of the manifest antagonism in certain congressional circles, the National Grange succeeded in securing 15 minutes for the testimony of Prof. T. C. Atkeson." Was there any antagonism to your appearing before this committee?

Mr. ATKESON. Not a bit in the world. I came in here without any expectation of making a statement. The Chairman recognized the fact that I was here and said, "We have 15 minutes." I looked at my watch and saw it was about 15 minutes before 12 o'clock. I think someone asked a question as to interference with my 15 minutes, and the hearing was continued until about 20 minutes after 12, giving me on the whole about 35 minutes, including the questions asked and answered.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated to the committee that less than 15 minutes would satisfy you?

Mr. ATKESON. I said it would be entirely satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. And you got over 35 minutes?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then in the middle of your remarks you stated that as far as you were concerned, you were through. You also stated on page 73 that: "I have come to the place where I could say all I have to say in a very few minutes."

Mr. ATKESON. That is correct. The rest of the notice I have absolutely nothing to do with.

The CHAIRMAN. This is from our record. Now, it is implied in this article that although you represented the great organization of the National Grange, you were asked whom you represented. Did you feel that there was any disrespect to you in asking whom you represented?

Mr. ATKESON. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. You knew that was the customary way to introduce a witness to a committee?

Mr. ATKESON. I had absolutely no ground to feel that I had been shown anything but the most absolute courtesy on the part of this committee, in the most good-humored way, and off-handedly. I would have been satisfied with 5, 10, or 15 minutes. I left this room in the most good humor I ever was in in my life. Any implication or any statement from any source whatever that indicates anything else is absolutely unfounded in fact, and unthought of until I read this notice, and I resent that notice as much as you gentlemen of the committee do.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any idea of the source of it?

Mr. ATKESON. I have a suspicion that it was a newspaper man. Just as I was leaving the room a gentleman asked me my name and when I asked who he was I was told that he was a newspaper man.

Mr. ELSTON. Is that gentleman in the room?

Mr. ATKESON. He was out in the corridor at the time.

Mr. ELSTON. He is not in the room now?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not ask for further time when you were heard before?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you feel that you had ample time to express your views?

Mr. ATKESON. I had all the time I wanted, absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Just another matter, Mr. Atkeson, in regard to the correction of your testimony. Mr. Graham asked you this question: "Then if your association had been passing upon that, you would have opposed the homestead laws of 1863?" Your answer was, according to the notes: "We are opposed to wholesale homestead laws." Then that answer was stricken out and this inserted in the notes returned: "It is impossible for me to know what farmers would have done 50 years ago."

This matter was brought up before the committee and they thought if you wanted to make any explanation of that answer you should come before the committee and not strike out the answer.

Mr. ATKESON. I am perfectly willing to print the statement if it is correct, and I recall making that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. If you wish to make any further explanation of your answer, the committee will be glad to hear you.

Mr. ATKESON. The two propositions are not comparable in any way. The homestead proposition, as you all know, was a question of public lands for soldiers. I live on a farm now which was surveyed by President Washington as a military survey. It came through Washington and his heirs to my father and to myself. Following the Civil War we had whole States, almost, of fertile and productive farm land, and the soldiers were granted homestead privileges on those lands.

I do not think there is any comparison, from any standpoint, between a proposition to expend a half a billion dollars in reclaiming this unproductive land and offering unoccupied lands 50 years ago. That is what I wanted to convey by that statement. It was impossible for a man to know what they would have said at that time. But this is what happened, so far as the Eastern States are concerned: A great many men who owned lands were trying to cultivate them, and they were bankrupt as a result of this rather promoted development of these enormously productive prairie lands in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. As a result of the homesteads?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. I have an illustration in my home State, where land that sold before the Civil War for more than \$100 an acre, a very few years afterwards sold at \$30 an acre. Now, something happened, and somebody got hurt. The farm people are a little afraid. Personally, I am not at all afraid.

The CHAIRMAN. But the ultimate good was the development of the Nation?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Which far surpassed any temporary discomfort that anyone may have suffered, if they did suffer?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. Now, there is just one other explanation I want to make, and only one other, I think, and that comes out of a statement made by one of the city papers. Perhaps I made the impression that I undertook to cover too much territory in 15 minutes. I realized that then, and I realized it afterwards when I saw the statement. One of the city papers, in a little four-line statement, called attention to the fact that the reason the Grange people were opposed to the Lane proposition was because they were afraid of competition. Now, I can submit all the records you want, if I had time, to show that we have never feared legitimate competition. I said, as well as I remember—and if you have the statement we can compare it—that if this is a soldier proposition—I will not attempt to quote my language, but this is my thought—if it is to benefit the soldier, if that is the primary purpose, then it should apply to all soldiers, whether they wished to live in the country or the city, or engage in farming or in any other occupation—I think you will find that is, in substance, my statement—that the farmers could not see why their business had been singled out to be discriminated against; that soldiers who wanted to farm should not be discriminated in favor of as against those soldiers who did not want to farm. I tried to put that thought into words. I think in the statement it is a little vague and hurried.

Now, how much time can you give me? I do not want to hurry too much.

The CHAIRMAN. You can have all the time you want.

Mr. ATKESON. Much obliged.

The CHAIRMAN. You asked permission to have inserted in the record certain editorials, and here they are. The committee thought that you ought to appear before them in that connection, so that they might question you upon the editorials.

Mr. ATKESON. I did not know whether I had the privilege of inserting them or not.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not want to exclude them.

Mr. ATKESON. I found them in my office and they were very pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to read these to the committee?

Mr. ATKESON. I do not know. I think perhaps I may if I have time.

Mr. RAKER. Before you go into the explanation of this matter I would like to ask you a question, Mr. Atkeson. Does your organization repudiate this entire five page circular that was sent out to all the members and everybody else as a newspaper editorial?

Mr. ATKESON. You mean this statement that the chairman read?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. ATKESON. We are not responsible for any of them except where it quoted me.

Mr. RAKER. I am talking about your organization. They say the organization has opened headquarters in Washington and they are going to fight this legislation, and the general matter referred to by the chairman. Now, I want to know not only as to this, but have you taken this matter up with the executive committee of the organi-

zation, and have you and do they repudiate this sort of anonymous circularizing by some one who does not belong to or have anything to do with the organization?

Mr. ATKESON. Nothing whatever. It does not emanate from our office.

Mr. RAKER. Then, as a matter of fact, you intend to tell the committee that that is a spurious document of five pages, written by somebody——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Judge, let me interrupt you: There are more than five pages. There are three different press notices. The first two contain two pages each, and the last contains five.

Mr. ATKESON. I never saw any of those.

Mr. RAKER. Then you intend to tell the committee that this document, so far as you and your organization are concerned, has been promulgated without your knowledge and consent, and is spurious, and is repudiated by you and your organization.

Mr. ATKESON. We had nothing to do with it whatever—with its promulgation.

Mr. RAKER. Then you are ready to answer that it is a spurious document, gotten up to misrepresent you and the committee, without your knowledge or your organization's knowledge or consent. That is right, is it?

Mr. ATKESON. That is the situation.

Mr. HERSMAN. Have you the slightest idea from whence this document emanated?

Mr. ATKESON. It could only be a guess, a very vague one. I have no information; I do not know, but I have my suspicions and I am trying to locate that press circular.

Mr. HERSMAN. I will ask you further: If you continue this investigation, will you report to this committee if you find out in any way who wrote it?

Mr. ATKESON. I will be perfectly willing to give you the name if I find it. I will say, frankly, that we are trying to find out who wrote it.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask you a general question?

Mr. ATKESON. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. You stated that one of your objections is that it will discriminate against a certain class of soldiers who do not want to go on farms. Do you not believe that when you develop 100,000 homesteads in the country the merchants and mechanics would be benefited by the increased market brought about by the increased use of harness, clothing, machinery, and supplies?

Mr. ATKESON. It is probably true that in the course of time it would have that effect. This scheme would be put into productive operation so slowly that I think it would affect the food supply very seriously.

Mr. SMITH. But you have not suggested anything better or even anything different.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; I am going to suggest something before we get through.

Mr. BAER. How many members are there in the grange which you represent?

Mr. ATKESON. The best way I know to answer that is to say that the expenses of our office in this city, which was established in this city

last January, are costing its members 1 cent apiece, and we appropriated \$10,000, and you can find out easily what the membership is.

Mr. BAER. I understand about half of them are women; the women belong to it as well as the men?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, but not half. Probably minors and women represent about half. About one-half of our membership, we estimate, are voters; and since the ladies will vote they will all be there pretty soon.

Mr. TAYLOR. A representative of the Federation of Labor appeared here and said that every soldier taken out of a town and furnished a job furnished an opportunity of obtaining a home—that that of itself benefited all the rest of those that were left there in town, by reducing that much competition; that every fellow who does not go on the farm is benefited to a certain extent by the fellow who goes on the farm and ceases being in competition for the jobs that are left, and becomes a producer to that extent in reducing the high cost of living problem. Do you subscribe to that idea?

Mr. ATKESON. Our Federation of Labor people are not making many mistakes these days. They know that is a fact—the statement you made—and I know it is a fact, and they are not making any mistakes, from their standpoint.

Mr. TAYLOR. From a labor standpoint they would like to see a great many of them go on the farm?

Mr. ATKESON. Unquestionably. I am afraid if they get enough of them out there there would be so much food produced that nobody could get any kind of price for it, and they would all flock back to town again.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no danger of that.

Mr. ATKESON. I am inclined to think that as long as I appear here in a representative capacity I am justified in trying to put this organization of farmers right before the committee. If I misrepresent it or represent it inefficiently, that is my misfortune. This is not my first experience in this sort of thing.

Mr. FERRIS. Might I interrupt you before you go into that? What is the relation of the American Farmers' Union and different unions of the farmers, and the unions of the laboring people? Have they not had a sort of federation whereby they are all working and pulling in the same direction; and if not, what is that relation?

Mr. ATKESON. They are entirely separate in all their relations in life, so far as I know. There is no quarrel on between any of them.

Mr. FERRIS. Where is the Farmers' Union? I had a talk with a gentleman a few years ago, and I think he told me there was a movement on foot whereby the Farmers' Union and the Grange—perhaps I am mistaken about the Grange—and the other farmers' unions, whatever they may be, had formed an alliance with the labor unions, and they were all fighting in the same direction. It is true some were producers and some were consumers, and I think I had the figures as to the membership of each organization at that time, but I think they had all settled down in one happy family and were all working to the same end?

Mr. ATKESON. You mean all the farmers' organizations?

Mr. FERRIS. They had intermingled and allied themselves with the labor unions.

Mr. ATKESON. So far as I know there has been no such attempt.

Mr. SMITH. What about the Buffalo convention last year, when Mr. Gompers spoke, and Mr. Townley, representing the Non-Partisan League? Did they not pass resolutions along that line?

Mr. ATKESON. I am pretty familiar with those people. Their official paper comes to our office once a week. There are a good many farmers' organizations in this country, and we have been here longer than any of them. During these 50 years we have seen a good many of them turn their toes up to the daisies and pass to the happy beyond, and we will probably be here when some of those that are here now have done the same thing.

Mr. FERRIS. What farmers' organizations have belonged to the labor unions? Have not a number of farmers' organizations gone into the labor unions, so that they are made up in one organization? You say the grange has not. Has not the Non-Partisan League done it?

Mr. BAER. I have never heard of any direct affiliation between the Non-Partisan League and labor. The only thing is that the Non-Partisan League has advocated certain legislation that labor was sympathetic toward, has indorsed that legislation, agreed to vote for it, and voted for it; but they are not joined in one organization.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not mean that. I thought there was an allied league among them of some sort, where they had all come under one tent, not in name, but an organization so comprehensive in scope that it took in all these organizations.

Mr. BAER. I think you are right so far as the farmers' organizations are concerned. There is a short extract from the master's address at the State grange of Washington this year, in which he states the membership of the grange. I thought it ought to be put into the record because it is interesting to know that in the Middle Western States the granges are not so strong. I will quote this in the record.

Mr. FERRIS. How long is it?

Mr. BAER. Very short. This is from the address of William Bouck, who has been reelected master of the grange in Washington. I understand it is about as strong there as anywhere else in the West.

Thirty-three State organizations are represented in the National Grange, with a combined membership of 620,000. This membership is mainly in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. West of Michigan the only States of considerable membership are Kansas, Colorado, Oregon, and our own State. This leaves the grange with very poor membership in the great agricultural States of the Central West, and shows the wisdom of granges getting together with the great progressive farm organizations of that section for joint action in support of a common national legislative program. While the National Grange has not joined us in the Farmers' National Council or in our Farmers' National Headquarters, through which we are working with other grange organizations, we are glad to say the present officers are showing a good spirit of cooperation with our headquarters in all legislative matters in which there is common agreement.

Later on in his address, still quoting Mr. Bouck, Master of Washington State Grange:

Among the farm organizations with which we are allied through our national headquarters and the Farmers' National Council are the American Society of Equity, the National Gleaner Federation, the National Creamery Butter Makers' Association, the National Nonpartisan League, the largest of the State farmers' unions, and, with a few exceptions, the State granges with which we have been associated in national work.

That is the end of the quotation. So that, regardless of the statement made before the committee that the National Nonpartisan League did not represent the grange, Mr. Bouck says that they are cooperating together. I do not know anything about it myself.

Mr. FERRIS. I had heard that in so many different ways I wanted to find out the truth of it.

Mr. BAER. Now, I quote again from Mr. Bouck's address:

The movement begun in this State under the leadership of Brother Kegley to bring the farm and labor organizations together to work for their common interests through a joint legislative committee, and in the national field, also under the leadership of Brother Kegley, begun by the progressive State granges, is being taken hold of by the progressive farm and labor organizations throughout the country. Thus one more of the pioneer efforts of the Washington State Grange has fully demonstrated its importance. It is in making common cause in this way that the workers are winning their battles.

Mr. FERRIS. It is things like that that have gotten me confused. I do not pretend to say or know anything about it. I beg your pardon, Mr. Atkeson, for this interruption.

Mr. ATKESON. I have no objection to being interrupted.

Mr. FERRIS. It was with no discourtesy, but merely with an inquiring mind.

Mr. ATKESON. I have read before what has just been read. You all understand that the grange organization is composed of subordinate granges or organizations down in the schoolhouses or country churches and grange halls, and we have grange halls running all the way from a few dollars, made out of rough lumber, up to \$20,000 or \$30,000, made of the best lumber in the country. We have county granges and we have State granges, and once a year the delegates all assemble and constitute the National Grange. Individual members, sometimes subordinate granges or State granges, get at variance with the national body. That is the failure of humanity, I reckon. But the National Grange in its organic capacity is the only organization that has any authority to speak for the entire membership nationally, just as the National Congress deals with national problems and not with State problems.

Now, in our office here we prepared a little circular which has been sent to every Member of Congress, and in that little booklet we said just what we meant, and I am going to read a couple of paragraphs:

The Grange representatives are not lobbyists in the usually accepted meaning of that term, and there are no unclean dollars paying us for our service.

It costs the members of our organization just about 1 cent apiece a year—our munificent compensation in this city. Mr. Loomis, my associate, and I are representing our membership very cheaply.

Mr. RAKER. You get a salary for your work, do you not?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. To continue:

We are in Washington in a spirit of helpful cooperation in our efforts to place before Congress and the various departments the true farmers' viewpoint of the food-production problems which are now receiving so much attention, and upon which the welfare of all our people so largely depends.

In a spirit of helpfulness we hope to go over these rural problems with the Members of Congress and with congressional committees who have a charge of the measures affecting the interests of agriculture in order that we may, if possible, assist them in arriving at a fair and unbiased understanding of the problems and points of view of the real farmers. With this object in view we

will be glad to have the facilities of this office made use of by the Members of Congress to the fullest extent. We extend a very cordial invitation to each of you to visit the Grange office at any time.

Now, I have here the journal of the last National Grange session.

Mr. RAKER. Before you go into that, let me ask you this question if it does not interrupt you: Does your organization in general convention assembled, through resolution or otherwise, direct its executive committee, through its president and secretary, to appear before the various committees in Congress to urge this legislation?

Mr. ATKESON. You mean to oppose the land proposition?

Mr. RAKER. You did not answer my question.

Mr. ATKESON. I did not quite catch it.

Mr. WHITE. He asked you a question, Judge.

Mr. RAKER. I asked you if this organization in convention assembled at any time voted, by resolution or otherwise, that the executive committee or its officers should advocate or oppose this proposed legislation known as the soldiers' homestead bill?

Mr. ATKESON. I thought I answered it that they did vote to oppose the Lane proposition, and I was going to read the action of the body itself.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but you did not answer my question. Outside of this resolution, did they request or direct that their executive committee appear before the various committees of Congress to oppose this legislation?

Mr. ATKESON. They undoubtedly did. The executive committee was in this city a week ago last Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, repeatedly, and the body itself is on record by unanimous vote. I want to read two or three paragraphs here in order that we may put this organization squarely on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, Mr. Atkeson. You said "by unanimous vote." Unanimous vote of what?

Mr. ATKESON. The National Grange.

The CHAIRMAN. That was at the last meeting?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There was not a dissenting vote?

Mr. ATKESON. Not a dissenting vote. Now, before I read this I would like this committee to keep this fact in mind: That the day I arrived in Syracuse, N. Y., to attend this meeting of the National Grange was the day following the signing of the armistice, and I heard more noise than I ever heard in my life by the time we struck the city of Buffalo, and when we got to the city of Syracuse it was in the forenoon, and they kept it up all day and all night and all the next day. Our organization assembled the next day, and we were the first organization of any considerable number of people to assemble anywhere except to jolify for the signing of the armistice, and we undertook to deal with reconstruction problems. We were pretty near to the end of our turmoil of war, and these are among the things we said:

The farmers of America are proud of their part in the world war. In loyalty and devotion, in food production, in financial aid, and in the gift of their sons they have again shown their sturdy Americanism and have justified the confidence always reposed in them when serious danger threatens the Republic.

Just as agriculture has had a vital part in the war, so it must have a strong voice in the reconstruction program that is to follow. This task is hardly less gigantic than the great war itself and will command the best thought of our leaders. Broad-minded statesmanship demands that our entire citizenship, without distinction of class or occupation, shall unite in keeping the Nation steady in the inevitable price-leveling process that must come. Justice to all must accordingly be uppermost in our minds, while we insistently urge that the interests of agriculture so fundamental to the prosperity of the whole Nation must be safeguarded at every point.

Holding the first national gathering of farmers since peace has become definitely assured, it is clearly the duty of the National Grange as a recognized spokesman of the organized farmers of America to state clearly and forcefully the needs and demands of agriculture in the program of readjustment. To fail is to invite neglect and to merit contempt.

We therefore present the following statements and recommendations as a platform upon which the farmers of the country may stand as a program of reconstruction with confidence that their interests are carefully safeguarded and their welfare assured.

Profitable agriculture: Profitable agriculture is the keynote of our declaration. A prosperous and progressive agriculture with an independent, self-respecting citizenship in the open country is the surest guaranty of an enduring national life. Farming must be made as profitable as any other occupation involving the same amount of investment, business ability, and hard work or our democracy must fail and our people go hungry.

Mr. RAKER. Right in that connection, I would like to get this information: I understand this organization in convention assembled passed a resolution which in part you have read before the committee. That part opposes soldiers' homesteads or the settlement plan. That is right, is it?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, the executive committee has opened headquarters in Washington. Through what source is this paid?

Mr. ATKESON. How is that?

Mr. RAKER. Who pays for the executive committee's headquarters?

Mr. ATKESON. It is paid out of the funds of the National Grange.

Mr. RAKER. The National Grange voted to do that?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And it also paid the salaries of the president and secretary and executive officers while here in Washington preparing to oppose this legislation?

Mr. ATKESON. This was a mere incident—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I know, but you are not answering the direct question. That is right, is it not?

Mr. ATKESON. That is one reason; but we regarded this whole proposition from any standpoint as of minor importance compared with matters like merchant marine and the railroad question, and many other question which you gentlemen will have to deal with and which I am going to take up and hope to talk to this and other committees on.

Mr. RAKER. That is, in addition to opposing this legislation?

Mr. ATKESON. This is a mere incident. We did not come to do this and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mr. Atkeson. How much time do you think you will require?

Mr. ATKESON. Oh, I can quit at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I do not want you to quit. I wanted to suggest that you be allowed to conclude your remarks before questions are put to you.

Mr. ATKESON. How much time may I have? It is just 15 minutes after 12.

The CHAIRMAN. You can take your own time, but I want to get some idea of how long a time you wanted.

Mr. FERRIS. May we find out what is going on in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. They are trying to arrange for debate on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. ATKESON. I came up here the other day entirely unprepared to talk on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to give you all the time you want, but we have to make some arrangement about Members going over on the floor.

Mr. ATKESON. I can take 30 minutes. Can you give me 30 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we can. Then we will interrogate you afterwards?

Mr. ATKESON. Just at your pleasure. Above everything else I want to put this organization fairly before this committee. Everything we say and do is in absolute good humor.

The action of the National Grange in establishing headquarters here reads as follows:

Whereas the emergencies now confronting our country, and especially our agricultural industry, make it imperative that the National Grange should have a duly accredited representative at the National Capital—

Now, there are other people here claiming to represent the farmers, and they do it, but they do not represent the National Grange.

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive committee is hereby instructed to immediately establish grange headquarters in Washington City, under such safeguards and conditions as they may deem expedient, with due regard for the protection of the character and good name of the grange.

Second. That the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for the maintenance of said headquarters. All bills to be approved and paid as other bills against the National Grange are paid.

Third. That said headquarters shall be under the direction and control of the executive committee, and may be discontinued at any time at their discretion.

Fourth. That said headquarters may, and in our opinion should, cooperate with other farmers' organizations in support of such policies or measures as may be mutually agreed upon.

Now, there are some questions upon which we may agree with some of these other organizations like the Farmers' Union and the Society of Equity, and we may mutually support them; there are other questions that are absolutely hopeless.

Mr. FERRIS. How does your organization cooperate with the Nonpartisan League? Do you get along together all right?

Mr. ATKESON. We have not gone into the Nonpartisan League business. I think the feeling of our membership is that if they can get away with it and make good—they are pioneers out there—the whole world will call them a blessing; but if they fail to do it, which a few years will demonstrate, then they will have to take the consequences of their state socialistic line, as we call it, and our organization is in no way socialistic. I think that is a fair answer.

I am not going to read this reconstruction platform that we adopted two or three days after the war closed, but there were nine gentlemen constituted a special committee to formulate this plat-

form, and I do not know their politics, except three or four of them, although I have known them for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. What are their names?

Mr. ATKESON. L. H. Wright, of Indiana; J. C. Ketcham, of Michigan; L. J. Taber, of Ohio; C. C. King, of Oklahoma; W. J. Thompson, of Maine; C. E. Spence, of Oregon; S. J. Lowell, of New York; B. Needham, of Kansas, and myself. They were the nine men, all masters of State granges, who prepared this platform, and they were distributed from Maine to Oregon, and as between political parties, so far as I know, all the parties were represented.

There are two or three of these paragraphs that logically bear on this question. I would not take your time to read them. There are two or three that deal with railroads and public highways. I will just mention the public highways and what they have to do with our policy so far as the soldiers are concerned. Before I go any further I want to disabuse your mind of any thought that I would not do everything on earth that can legitimately be done for the benefit of the soldiers. It was my fortune to have eight nephews in the Army. Four went to France; one of them is buried there; one is still there in the Army; the other two have returned. The other four have been demobilized; they did not get across. Some of these nephews of mine were farmer boys, and one of them, who came home a lieutenant, is the son of a brother who is a practicing attorney and was a candidate for Congress last year, and happened to be in a district where his political party did not get enough votes, and although he is not of the same political party as mine I do not think any the less of him, because if I had been in the State I would have scratched my ticket and voted for him.

Now, speaking about the highway and what it has to do with this Lane proposition, I want to show that we have duly considered the question, not only last November, but ever since the Lane plan has been proposed.

The welfare of agriculture demands an aggressive road-construction policy by the National, State, and local Governments. We demand that Federal funds shall not be used in an extensive boulevard system to be used by the few, but that market and post roads, the highways over which must travel the food supplies of a nation, be given first consideration. Such a system of roads will meet every possible military need of the future. Instead of sentimental effort to use returning soldier labor on doubtful schemes of drainage, irrigation, etc., we urge that road construction be used as a shock absorber against an oversupply of labor caused by the return of soldiers from the front.

You will certainly have the roads left if they are properly constructed. I could read all these paragraphs in their logical sequence, but I will not inflict that upon you.

Land tenantry is rapidly increasing, farm property is concentrating in the hands of wealthy landholders, and abandoned farms are becoming altogether too common. In the face of these conditions every means should be provided to assist the young man of character and training to secure a homestead of his own. The largest possible number of owners operating and living on their farms is the surest guarantee of the perpetuity of American agriculture. To this end we favor such modification of the farm land bank law as will extend its benefits still more widely.

That is, in the case of soldiers we will extend it to the entire amount instead of half.

We advocate the establishment of a system of personal cooperative credit to enable tenant farmers and small-farm owners to extend their operations and avail themselves of the economies which command of credit always affords.

Now, regarding "farms for soldiers":

We oppose the proposed plan of providing swamp and arid lands, by drainage and irrigation, for returning soldiers as unsound and impractical and detrimental to the best interests of the Nation and agriculture.

We believe that is absolutely true.

The time may come that will justify this huge expenditure of public funds, but that time is not now.

This plan fails to take into consideration the previous occupations, desires, or ambitions of these boys and the economic welfare of established agricultural communities.

There is an abundance of unused and untenanted farms and available farm lands near established market centers to supply all needs in this direction. The Government should offer our heroic soldier boys who desire it such help as will enable them to secure farm homes of their own.

Now, in those few paragraphs you have a rather systematic plan. Build roads as a shock absorber of surplus labor. I am going to make one remark and then I will be ready to answer any questions and be ready to quit.

Following the Civil War we sold wheat at \$3.80 a bushel. On that same farm within a few years we sold wheat at 50 cents a bushel, and my father nearly went into bankruptcy; not quite.

Now, if the Government appropriates a half billion of money—and it is a wonder how it grows! It was \$100,000 and then a newspaper article I read figured it at \$300,000, and when I got Mr. Mondell's bill it was \$500,000. I am afraid to look at anybody else's bill, because it may be \$1,500,000. I do not know where we are going to get it. But this proposition is absolutely sound: That if you undertake to drain any swamp land in this country or irrigate any arid land in this country, at the present scale of cost of effecting that reclamation, there is not a man living to-day who will undertake to reimburse the Government, if the price of food products should drop one-half, which was normal before the war, and be able to pay the cost of that reclamation, with isolated exceptions, if he should live 1,000 years.

If we are going to tax the taxpayers of this country on a reclamation scheme—let us put it on that basis and stand fair and square—I do not believe there is a sane soldier in this country to-day who, when these lands are reclaimed, on the present scale of wages and other costs of reclaiming, which includes machinery and all appliances necessary, when asked to accept that land and reimburse the Government, as Mr. Mondell's bill provides—well, he ought to have a place in an insane asylum if he would tackle the job. I have been in every State in the country except Arkansas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico, and when I talk about farm problems I know something about what I am talking about.

Let me tell a story: In the days when everybody had timber down in our State and the portable sawmill first came out, shiftless people got this sawmill and went out and cut up timber and had a jolly time. They got credit at the local stores and then went broke, and the manufacturer took the sawmill back at a reduced payment. There was an old fellow named Meeks who stuttered, and he had

a little quarrel with a neighbor over some matter in the store. The old man wanted to wish him the worst thing he could think of, and he said, "I—I—I wish you had a sawmill! D—d—d—damn you, I wish you had two sawmills"! And if that did not finish him I wonder what would. If our American soldiers want this proposition, all right, but if I had an enemy I would wish he had one of those farms, and then I would wish he had two of them, and if that would not finish him, I wonder what would.

It is an economic impossibility, on the present scale of cost of reclamation, for any man to take this land—I do not care where it is—and get ashore with it. I say that, and I have wrestled with farm problems for 65 years. I have touched the farm problem at more angles than any other living man in America. I was raised on a farm, engaged in productive farm industry from 12 years of age, on a 16-hour basis, and spent five years as a farm hand at 75 cents a day, after I was married. I was a farm renter for five years, then bought a farm and paid taxes on thousands of dollars of my debts, because the land was assessed at its value. About the time I got that farm paid for my State agricultural college invited me to go to the institution, where they did not have much agriculture. I went up there to organize the agricultural department and stayed 23 years. To-day they carry my name in the catalogue as "professor emeritus." In all that time I never went loose from that farm that I paid for—five-sixths of it—part of it by day labor, part of it rented, part of it in money. I say five-sixths, because I inherited one-sixth.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you ready for questions now?

Mr. ATKESON. This is a large subject. I will answer your questions now.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to these press notices, you said you did not know the individual who got them out. Do you know the organization who is responsible for them?

Mr. ATKESON. For those press notices?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; I do not. I do not think there is any organization. My own impression is that it was some enterprising newspaper man.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a few more questions. I want to see just how far we are apart. I understand your organization, from its resolutions, is in favor of legislation to encourage farm home owning and to discourage tenantry. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ATKESON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your organization says, in its resolution on page 8, that—

There is an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all soldiers who may wish farm land. The Government should meet this need in this way, so that they may become self-supporting and useful without waste and delay.

The resolution you read had the words "unused and untenanted farms." That is true, is it not? That there are untenanted farms near market centers?

Mr. ATKESON. If you will take the trolley to Annapolis, as I did the other day, you will see something.

The CHAIRMAN. There are untenanted lands between Washington and Annapolis?

Mr. ATKESON. Enough to feed this city.

The CHAIRMAN. That might be used for soldier homes?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Secretary Lane agrees with you on that and agrees with your resolution. He says that within 50 miles of Washington there are innumerable farms that might be used, and you say in your resolution that the "Government should meet this need in this way."

Mr. ATKESON. Do you know why those lands are not used and need reclaiming? Some of it is too wet and some too dry.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I have noticed them in the vicinity and between here and New York, and if the farmers in the West were in this part of the country they would soon have them under cultivation.

Mr. ATKESON. The reason they are not cultivated is that it would not pay to reclaim them, and if you take the taxpayers' money and reclaim them and expect somebody to reimburse the Government you will not find many takers.

The CHAIRMAN. You state in your resolution that legislation should be devised to encourage farm home owning. We are agreed that far, that these farms in the eastern section of the country should be utilized for the soldiers. Is that true?

Mr. ATKESON. That is right; or in any other section where the proposition is economically sound. As an extreme illustration. I could raise oranges on top of Pike's Peak or in Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. In the hothouse?

Mr. ATKESON. But I could not sell them for a nickel apiece.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not raise them economically?

Mr. ATKESON. I could not raise them economically; no. I could raise apples in West Virginia but not in Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, when you refer to reclamation I take it you mean the irrigation of arid lands and the drainage of swamp lands?

Mr. ATKESON. Or the reclaiming of any other land that ordinary business horse sense would not show was a sane financial proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not do that with land that could not be economically developed?

Mr. ATKESON. And I would not do that with the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the committee agrees with you and the Secretary of the Interior agrees with you, that such land should not be taken up and that only land should be utilized that can be economically utilized for that purpose.

Mr. ATKESON. There is no such land in this country at the present cost of reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think so?

Mr. ATKESON. Not if the food prices go down, as I believe they will.

The CHAIRMAN. Referring to irrigated land, the farmers in my district—and these men are actual farmers—have voted bond issues within the last two years of nearly \$10,000,000 to irrigate land where they now dry-farm and where they now partially irrigate. These men are actual farmers and they have sold within the last year something under \$5,000,000 worth of those bonds. That is for irrigation projects.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, should it appear that the Government reclamation projects have made a success and are paying, would that in any way modify your views that you have expressed on irrigation?

Mr. ATKESON. Well, the Government is attempting to do a great many things. The economic objection to attempting these things now is based largely on the assumption that the cost of reclamation is double what it would be under normal conditions, and that the products of a farm would be half what they are now, which would make it economically impossible. There is one other objection. I do not want to omit that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; what is it?

Mr. ATKESON. There is one other objection that our organization makes to Mr. Lane's plan, and I am glad you put me in mind of it. We are opposed to the whole colonization scheme as radically un-American and undemocratic. It presupposes a sort of overlordism. The projects are limited to 5,000 acres or more. It provides for a lot of Utopian schemes. I have some of Mr. Lane's stuff here, and it reads like a dream book.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me interrupt you there. You did not have in your convention any concrete bill before you when you discussed the matter?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You discussed it from the viewpoint of some of Secretary Lane's exuberant rhetoric?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean exuberant from your viewpoint.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. Now, we are opposed to any form of State socialism, to take the taxpayers' money and go out and acquire Government land. This scheme provides for laying out town lots and a multitude of things, and these soldiers can not even sell this land if they go on it. You will have to tie them because they will want to abandon most of it before the 10-year period is out. It is based on what we regard as a fundamentally un-American principle.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider that there is anything un-American or socialistic about the present reclamation projects?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all in a colony, as it were?

Mr. ATKESON. They are disposed of in severalty. The man acquires possession and pays for it like any other land.

The CHAIRMAN. It is contemplated that where large units are selected the same process will go on as is now going on on the Government reclamation projects.

Mr. ATKESON. We had an attempt some years ago in my State to establish a community. These people were spiritualists, and it was their religion, or lack of religion, that brought them together with common interest. They flourished for a while and then the community was abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN. But this plan is not like those old colony plans. The one that Hawthorne was on—what was the name of that?

Mr. VAILE. It was called "Meadow Brook."

The CHAIRMAN. You realize that the lands here are disposed of in severalty. They do not work the whole thing in community. Each man has his own individual unit and will eventually get a patent.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes; but there is a community of interest contemplated in the whole proposition; for instance, about the marketing. That is how some of our milk dealers got into trouble with the Sherman law in Chicago when they tried to sell their stuff in community.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not your organization approve of collective selling?

Mr. ATKESON. Selling and buying.

The CHAIRMAN. "Wherever necessary in State or Nation to establish beyond question the right of producers of farm products to bargain collectively for their sale." That is what you say in one of your resolutions.

Mr. ATKESON. But that is different from this proposition. You take the taxpayer's money and invest it, whether it is ever returned or not; and if that is not State socialism, we fail to know what the words "State socialism" mean.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is what they are doing on the Government reclamation projects. They are spending money out of the Treasury, from the Government reclamation fund, to build up these projects. I have never heard any accusation made against that plan as being socialistic.

Mr. ATKESON. There is a great deal of argument against it. The Government has proceeded on the theory that the Government reclamation projects will be worth what they cost.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you a question, if you will pardon me. Have you thought about a case of this kind: A good many soldiers will come back from the war in your part of the country, and you say you have a large number of abandoned, unused farms—unoccupied lands?

Mr. ATKESON. All over the country.

Mr. WHITE. And that the productive quality of the land has depreciated, and it is not a good dividend-producing proposition. Now, we will suppose a young man comes back, the son of a poor farmer, who may be poor for any number of reasons, and he will say to his father: "I would like to buy one of these farms." In case he is not able to capitalize it himself, do you think it would be a good idea for the Government to cooperate with him and assist him with a loan? Had you thought about that?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; not in furnishing him money but in furnishing him Government credit.

Mr. WHITE. I mean loaning him the money.

Mr. ATKESON. All through the land-bank discussion our organization took an active part, and it was my fortune, or misfortune, to appear before committees in support of the land-bank scheme. I made this argument and I cited this specific case. We insisted that we should loan these purchasers more than 50 cents on the dollar, and that was finally written in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated a while ago you would rather have full value than half?

Mr. ATKESON. That was for the soldier, so that the soldier could go out and find land wherever he wanted it, and wherever he found it the Government would give him credit and sell bonds. Mr. Morgan stated the other day that he had a proposition in his bill that would be worthy of consideration—

Mr. WHITE (interposing). I want to know your view on it, Mr. Atkeson. I made my question hypothetical, but it is not hypothetical because it is absolutely true. There will be hundreds of instances of this kind. I am not stating my views, but I would like to have yours if you are ready to express them.

Mr. ATKESON. I cite this case: Assuming that you leave the land-bank laws as they now stand; that a gentleman has three sons and a fairly good farm for one, but they all want a farm. I know of hundreds of those cases. He is out of debt; his farm is worth say \$20,000. He gives a mortgage on his farm for \$10,000 and tells his son to buy a farm as good as that.

Mr. WHITE. That is distorting the question. My proposition is where he is the son of a poor farmer, where he would have to go to the city, when we are trying to keep them out of the city and in the country. If my question is not clear, it is all right, but I would be glad to have your view. Of course, I have no right to insist on it; I want to be polite.

Mr. ATKESON. In the resolution I read we said we recommended some system of personal credit where a man's character, skill, and industry should be utilized to make it possible for him to acquire land, and that is dealing with the question of land tenantry. Give the man a fighting chance. Help him all you can by loaning him the Government credit, but not the taxpayer's money. There is a great difference between those two things—the Government credit and the taxpayer's money. I know by experience that it is easier to spend other people's money.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson, right there, the difference between you and the Mondell bill is a difference in plan. You believe in the plan of securing farms for soldiers?

Mr. ATKESON. Wherever they want them.

The CHAIRMAN. Through the medium of the land bank?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, it is just a difference in principle?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I was wondering why you set down different plans in your resolutions. Your first resolution, on page 8 of your little pamphlet—

Mr. ATKESON (interposing). Yes; those are only summaries.

The CHAIRMAN. It says: "Better farm credit: Every possible means should be provided to assist men of character and training to secure farm homes and to establish a system of personal credit for the purpose of increasing farm ownership. To this end we favor such amendment of the land-bank law as will extend its benefits more widely." There you refer especially to the land-bank law. Then, again: "Land tenantry: Land tenantry is increasing; farm ownership is concentrating in the hands of wealthy landholders, and abandoned farms are becoming too common. Legislation should be devised to encourage farm-home owning, and to discourage land speculation and tenantry." You say nothing in this resolution about the land bank, but you say that "legislation should be devised." Do you mean additional legislation, in addition to the land-bank legislation?

Mr. ATKESON. I have been asked by congressional committees and general assemblies as to what was the growing evil—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I do not want to interrupt you, but I want to know the meaning of this second paragraph, because in the preceding paragraph you say we should utilize the land-bank law, and in the next one you say that legislation should be devised.

Mr. ATKESON. That means to interfere with or prevent as far as possible by legislation the acquirement and holding of agricultural land by nonresident landholders. If I had the time I would tell you some things that perhaps you are not aware of in that connection. More than half of the best farms in this country are cultivated by tenants and owned by men living away from them.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean absentee landlords?

Mr. ATKESON. In the hands of landlords who live in the city. It should be feasible by legislation to remedy that condition. I have never been able to conceive of any remedy beside the graduated land tax.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, in your last resolution, on page 8, you refer to the unused and untenanted farms, and say that the "Government should meet this need in this way." What kind of legislation would your organization approve, or what did you have in contemplation when you enacted that resolution? What would you do to supply these soldiers with untenanted farms?

Mr. ATKESON. We had nothing but the land-bank law.

The CHAIRMAN. Just the land bank?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes; but we recommended the extension of the land bank law to include soldiers, so that John Smith and myself could not get a certain amount of land until we got half of the money. Now, if I had to extend that scheme to the soldiers I am ready to do it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that there is any exceptional opportunity extended to the soldier in this measure—any unusual opportunity?

Mr. ATKESON. In our proposition?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; in this bill.

Mr. ATKESON. I do not know. I have not studied it closely enough to answer that question. This is purely a reclamation proposition.

Mr. RAKER. Here is a hypothetical question and I would like to have you answer: Here is a farm between Washington and Annapolis containing 160 acres. It has a fair house on it, somewhat in want of repair. It has sufficient outbarns, 20 or 25 acres under cultivation, and the rest is grown up in brush, shrubbery, etc. It is being cultivated but little; 20 acres partially and the rest of it is not under cultivation. It is cultivable land and will produce a good crop. A young returning soldier comes along and wants to buy that. Its actual value is \$5,000 in the market. It is your purpose now that the law should be amended so that he may get the Government credit whereby he could buy that farm and let the Government stand sponsor for his credit, to the end that he might take up the farm? Is that the theory? Is that what you believe ought to be done?

Mr. ATKESON. I think that would be vastly better for the soldier and better for the taxpayer than the present proposition.

Mr. VAILE. You would favor it as regards a farm between here and Annapolis, but not as between places in the West or between places in the South?

Mr. ATKESON. Let the soldier determine where he wants to live, without being colonized.

Mr. VAILE. Then, if the soldier was willing to choose a farm in Colorado or California——

Mr. ATKESON (interposing). It would not make any difference.

Mr. VAILE. Your objection to irrigation or drainage would not apply?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Take another illustration: If the same kind of farm was anywhere the young man wanted it, in any other State in the Union, under like conditions you would say amend the law whereby he might take it up and get the Government credit to back the farm. Is that right?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; and for the machinery you already have the appraisers and land bank officials.

Mr. RAKER. Well; that is the machinery to work it out. I want to get your idea.

Mr. ATKESON. That does not look like we are afraid of competition. We are perfectly ready.

Mr. RAKER. If the soldier wants to get 40, 60, or 100, or 200 acres of land, I want to know if it is your belief or theory that he should be given the opportunity to obtain that piece of land wherever he wants it, anywhere in the United States, under like conditions?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; right in the neighborhood where he was reared.

Mr. RAKER. I do not care where it is.

Mr. ATKESON. Well, I will say any place, wherever he wants to locate land, except picking him up and colonizing him where he does not want to go.

Mr. RAKER. Now, let me go a little further.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose there is a tract of land of 100,000 acres, where 500 families may be placed, where the money invested in putting it in shape for cultivation will make it an attractive home for the soldier, and the money invested is not in excess of what would be a reasonable expenditure to put that land in shape. Do you object to putting that 100,000 acres of land in that condition so that these 500 soldiers may go on there and make their homes, if the conditions are favorable as to climate, soil, and the price for which it may be done?

Mr. ATKESON. We object to making our sympathy for the soldier or our desire to benefit the soldier a pretext for reclamation.

Mr. RAKER. I have not put any sympathy into my question. I am just as cold-blooded as a snake in asking this question. Assuming that you answered the other question as to 160 acres located anywhere, what distinction is there if you take that 160 acres and give him the sole right to select it? Is there any difference between that proposition and taking 100,000 acres and allowing 500 men to select it?

Mr. ATKESON. There is no difference in principle.

Mr. RAKER. If this 100,000 acres is good agricultural land and will produce good crops and can be put in cultivation without any extraordinary expense, is there any objection in your mind to putting that 100,000 acres in cultivation, so that the soldier might take it if he wants it?

Mr. ATKESON. None whatever if the soldier wants it. The last Reclamation Record gives in tabular form the crop report of King Hill project, Idaho, for last year. I will take the subject of wheat, because most people know wheat. Production of wheat, \$4 an acre; income, \$7.48. I will bet \$7.48 would not pay for putting water on it.

The CHAIRMAN. What project is that?

Mr. ATKESON. King Hill project.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the King Hill project?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; not personally.

The CHAIRMAN. Well let me tell you this. Wheat raising is not the ordinary crop on a Government reclamation project. They generally raise alfalfa.

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, King Hill project is one that has recently been taken over by the Government. It is not completed. It was a defunct project under the Carey Act. They did not have enough money to put it on its feet and complete it, and the Government, I think, in the sundry civil bill of last year, made an appropriation to take it over. That is the history of the King Hill project.

Mr. ATKESON. Alfalfa is a semiarid plant. That is, it is grown in a semiarid climate.

I just want to get these figures in the record. Taking all the products on that project, the total income per acre—total and average—is \$27.18 on that whole project. Now we will turn over to the prevailing crop prices on land in the Yellowstone project in Montana and North Dakota—it is in both States—in 1918. The wheat yield of this project was 15 bushels an acre, which is the average for the country, but the total acreage, which includes the production of alfalfa at \$33 an acre and alfalfa seed at \$66 an acre—the total production of those acres in that project was \$31.85. The crop on the Yellowstone project in Montana and North Dakota—that seems to be the same project—was \$11.39. That seems to be the same thing. The crop report for the Newell project in Nevada shows a total average of \$53.15.

Now, we have undertaken to ascertain what it has cost per acre in these reclamation projects. Mr. Lane does not give us any figures. We have tried through the Reclamation Service and we feel absolutely certain that there is not a single one of these propositions that is a paying proposition. I have been on some isolated fruit farms that are abandoned, in Colorado——

The CHAIRMAN. Name one.

Mr. ATKESON. I do not recall the name. There was one over beyond the hills.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the nearest town?

Mr. ATKESON. Salida was the nearest town, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Salida was the nearest town?

Mr. ATKESON. I do not know whether it was the nearest town.

The CHAIRMAN. What year were you there?

Mr. ATKESON. I think I was there in 1915.

Mr. SUMMERS. I want to call your attention to the fact that there is an irrigation project in my district of 200,000 acres that in 1918 averaged \$150 an acre income. There is another of 3,000 acres in

my district the income of which is stated to be \$280 an acre. I believe it is only fair to the arid lands, when you select some that have had the very lowest possible productions, that some others should be put in comparison with them.

Mr. ATKESON. Those are only four that Mr. Lane selected.

Mr. SUMMERS. You were quoting on the production of wheat?

Mr. ATKESON. I took all the other products, too.

Mr. SUMMERS. Then that is fair. That is what I have done in quoting my figures. I want you to bear in mind the \$150 from 200,000 acres and the \$280 from 3,000 acres. So that there are high and low productions in irrigated land the same as in nonirrigated land.

Mr. VAILE. Do you know the altitude of the land which you referred to as abandoned fruit farms in Colorado? You said they were near Salida.

Mr. ATKESON. It was in that section of Colorado. We stopped there a day on our way to Salt Lake City, and I can not recall exactly. Salida was the place where people were getting on, and they said they were abandoning those lands. After water had been put on for a few years and it soaked down, and by capillary action some alkali came to the surface, and they were abandoned.

Mr. VAILE. Do you know what railroad facilities they had in that part of the country for getting their produce to the markets?

Mr. ATKESON. Well, we were on the line of the Missouri Pacific.

Mr. VAILE. Did you have any opportunity to compare those lands on the western slope which are still selling for \$1,000 an acre and upward?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir; I was not out there on that business.

Mr. VAILE. This is the second or third time that you have referred to abandoned farms in Colorado, and I am frank to say I do not know where they are. Now, you said your organization favored the extension of the land-bank law?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. Did you mean by that that you favored the increase of facilities for loaning money to farmers?

Mr. ATKESON. Not to farmers generally. Our proposition is that if we are going to do something for the soldiers, we should do it through this organized machinery of the Government. You do not take the taxpayers' money, but you sell bonds.

Mr. VAILE. But it does involve advancing cash to the farmers.

Mr. ATKESON. Well, you would sell bonds.

Mr. VAILE. It involves loaning cash to the farmers.

Mr. ATKESON. But that is not the Government's money.

Mr. BAER. The Government has to secure those bonds. It is the Government's credit that you want?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAER. The Government would have to pay those bonds if the project failed?

Mr. ATKESON. If you are familiar with the land-bank system, a man can pay half the purchase price if the land-bank appraiser decides that is a fair price, and he can borrow the other half and have 36 years to pay for it.

Mr. VAILE. Would it be your suggestion that the farmer should be allowed to borrow a larger amount than half?

Mr. ATKESON. That is for the soldier only. I think that 50 cents on the dollar is not enough. In normal times 50 per cent on the present valuation may be too high, but that depends on the appraiser. When the land-bank law was enacted it could have been made 75 per cent. Every time the man makes a payment, every six months, you will have a much better security. Now, if the Government wants to show its generosity, without any reference to socialization, colonization, or a lot of other "izations" that we are opposed to, they can say to the soldier: "You can settle anywhere you want to live, in your own State"—

Mr. VAILE (interposing). Or anywhere else?

Mr. ATKESON. Anywhere he wants to in the United States, because I would not want him to leave the United States. He contracts for it in advance; the Government sees that the title is good and that the land is worth, say, \$10,000. The Government will take very little risk if the Government guarantees bonds under the land-bank system, if you are familiar with the land-bank system.

Mr. VAILE. It is based on the credit of the land ultimately is it not?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. The only risk would be the difference between what was paid for the land and what the Government would get for it if it was forfeited. Every time he made a payment he would be liquidating part of the debt, and it would be better and better security. He can sell that land at any time he pleases, and his successor simply steps into his shoes and takes up the payments.

Mr. VAILE. If your suggestion is that the land bank should be able to loan to the soldier a greater percentage of the value of the land he occupies, I can not see any difference between that plan and the Mondell bill, except that under the Mondell bill there is no provision that it shall be through the land bank, and it does not provide for alienation except within a certain period of time. Is there any difference?

Mr. ATKESON. There is very vital difference. One provides for the taxpayer's money and the other is based on the Government's credit. If the prices of farm products should go down one-half, it would become an economic impossibility for the majority of those farmers to get their money to pay off the debt. The soldiers are either crazy, if they undertake to do it, or bamboozled into a wild-cat scheme that they never can get ashore with, in the majority of cases.

Mr. VAILE. Are you familiar with the safeguards of this proposition that have been developed by the chairman of the committee in these hearings?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; I have read the bill there.

Mr. VAILE. Do you still think there is danger of using too much of the taxpayer's money?

Mr. ATKESON. On this level and the question of the purchaser being able to sell his products on the other level.

Mr. BAER. I think I am in sympathy with some of your ideas, Mr. Atkeson. That you want to see these soldiers given the land that they want; that there shall not be any forcing of men on land that they do not desire. Now, before the appropriation is made I recognize that the Secretary of the Interior will have to bring before the committee a statement of so many thousand soldiers who have already volitionally declared in which direction they want to go; that is, in which State

they want to settle on a farm. It is purely optional where the soldiers want to go. If they decide on 1,000 farms in Pennsylvania or 1,000 farms in Colorado, then we are not going to develop more land than they require. Your position seems to be that we are going out and arbitrarily take 100,000 acres of land and then force the soldier to that land. My idea is just the reverse; that we are going to ask the soldier where he wants to go, and if one wants to go to Colorado we are going to develop lands there, and that will be right in accord with your views.

Mr. ATKESON. It isn't pleasant to discuss the Secretary's returns from the soldiers, but I have talked with several hundred soldiers within the last six months and I have not found a single soldier yet, when this proposition was put to him, who would say that he expected to occupy one of those farms. He would go out there and go to work at \$7 and \$7 a day to reclaim one of those farms; but if you want to tie him to an impossibility—

Mr. BAER. We don't tie him to an impossibility. He has a choice.

Mr. ATKESON. But you have spent the taxpayer's money reclaiming those lands, which is not economically possible.

The CHAIRMAN. West Virginia is your State?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say that 432 soldiers have already written in favorable to the proposition from West Virginia.

Mr. ATKESON. They don't understand the proposition.

Mr. BAER. If they want the farm, they should have it. As I understand you in this plan, Mr. Lane is to find out where the soldiers want to go before we develop that land.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BAER. In regard to the Federal farm-loan bank, I have been interested in the same proposition Mr. Atkeson is—in extending credit; but so far as the liability goes, if the price of farm produce goes down one-half in the future, as you predict it may do, then there is just as much of a risk. He has got his money out of the Federal farm-loan bank as if he had it out of some other appropriation in Congress, because that makes an inability for him to meet the payments, and consequently the Government has to back up the Federal farm-loan bank as well as it would an appropriation, and they would lose the money anyway, so the sort of credit don't make any difference whether it comes from one department or the other department. But the point that you make that the machinery is already established in the farm-loan bank is a good point, but it is the taxpayer's money, no matter which way you go.

Mr. ATKESON. It is the taxpayer's money in one place, and it is the taxpayer's money whether you ever pay it back or not.

Mr. BAER. The soldier has got to pay this back into the Treasury. It is a sort of revolving fund.

Mr. ATKESON. It isn't unreasonable to expect that by the time these lands can be made available for production that the prices of farm produce in this country will be one-half as high as they are now. I would like to see that if other things are relatively as low. We can't continue at this high rate. If you reclaim these lands on the present level of prices, it is impossible for them to pay on that basis. Farm products are not very largely increased from what they were before the

war. In some places they have, but the normal increase has not been more than 25 per cent of the farm land.

It would be impossible for the Government to lose any very great amount of money, largely because there would be very few soldiers availing themselves of it. I know when I say that that the figures the Secretary has are in the air. You get down with the boys—

Mr. BAER. I have talked with 250,000 of them in the camps from tidewater to Bridgeport since last May—

Mr. ATKESON (interposing). They were all for it?

Mr. BAER. No; I don't think more than 16 per cent of them wanted farms, but the point is that those that do want farms are agreeable with you—they want to make their own choice. If we have farms over in West Virginia and these fellows want these farms, the Government should extend credit to them to buy the farms. I would go a little further. If they were farms that were run down, I would extend credit to resuscitate the farms just as we would in Colorado. If they want a farm there in the State of Colorado, which is to be irrigated, I would irrigate it, so it would be just about the same to extend them credit for fertilizer to resuscitate the soil which would cost about as much; the same as they would in North Dakota; and it would all fall back on the Government, and the Government would have to back up the guaranty when it was in the Federal reserve bank or farm loan bank or some other bank.

Mr. ATKESON. But in this proposition we lose sight of two basic facts. One of them is that the farms now are underfarmed, because they are undermanned, and other farms are not farmed at all simply because under present conditions they have not the boys to farm them. There is hardly a farm in the United States to-day that has man power on them to farm them adequately. There isn't a soldier in the United States to-day that can't get a farm-labor job at \$2.50 a day on the farm. They ought to do that a year or two before they attempt any of these "wildcat" schemes any way.

Mr. BAER. I don't like to hear you say "wildcat" schemes, because we are pretty well agreed that wherever the soldier wants to go—

Mr. ATKESON (interposing). It is unnecessary.

Mr. BAER. It is unnecessary if the soldier don't want it, but if the soldier expresses a desire to go to a certain place, they are aware of the fact that there are farmers in the community making a success on those farms, or they wouldn't be disposed to go there.

Mr. VAILE. The real gist of your argument is that you are opposed to any sort of reclamation schemes?

Mr. ATKESON. At this time; yes, sir.

Mr. BAER. In regard to that, I said to Secretary Lane that there were certain farms in the West that would be very expensive, and to be practical we should try to fertilize the land out here nearer the great industrial centers. I will quote from the hearing, as follows:

Mr. BAER. I am very much interested in seeing the market situation taken care of. Now, if they are located in eastern Montana or western North Dakota—and I am not casting reflection upon any State—the situation would be bad. Those farmers have become discouraged because they are so far away from market. They can not make good on them. If you take these men away out there, where you must develop railroads, the difficulties there would be great.

I think it would be practicable to try to fertilize these lands right near the great industrial centers.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not a fact that farmers on the reclaimed arid lands in the West are more prosperous than those who live in any other section of the country?

Mr. RAKER. If this bill is to stop the development of the West, it would seem to me—

Secretary LANE (Interposing). Mr. Baer's point is a perfectly good one. There has got to be some artificial incentive to bring about the reestablishment of people all around upon their own land where they have markets near at hand. You will find that sentiment very strong in States like Maine, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and all down the coast.

Mr. Lane has gone on record as favoring building up the farms in the Eastern States and in New England as well as he has in the West.

Mr. ATKESON. But he limits his project to 5,000 acres or more, and there isn't a body of 5,000 acres in my State a man can make a living on.

Mr. BAER. Is that in this bill, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It isn't in the bill.

Mr. BAER. I just thought if that was in the bill I would be opposed to it myself. That may be some of Mr. Lane's theories.

The CHAIRMAN. All his theories will have to run the gauntlet of the Federal farm-loan banks, the governors of the States, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. ATKESON. You have the bill in the record and it contemplates the community colonization scheme.

Mr. BAER. There is nothing said about the 5,000 acres.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson, how old are you?

Mr. ATKESON. If I were a woman I wouldn't tell, but at my last birthday I was 67 years of age.

The CHAIRMAN. You are old enough to remember the controversy over the passage of the homestead law?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. I lived through the Civil War and all the things that followed.

The CHAIRMAN. That controversy was raging from 1850 to 1862, at the time of the passage of the homestead law. Do you know that every objection that has been urged against this bill was urged against the passage of the homestead law? It was called communism and socialism.

Mr. ATKESON. I never heard it.

The CHAIRMAN. It was contended that they were taking money out of the Treasury of the United States, because the public land prior to that time was sold to raise revenues for the General Government. President Buchanan in his message to Congress said there was no distinction between taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and giving some one 160 acres of land. Every objection that we have heard urged before this committee was urged then. Let me read to you what McMaster wrote in his history on the introduction of the bill and see if these objections that we are hearing to-day are not repetitions of a great many of them and if they don't recall the old saying, "Hark, from the tomb, a doleful sound."

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES—M'MASTER.

(Vol. VIII, p. 108.)

In the House Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, became the champion of the landless, introduced a homestead bill, and strove manfully in its behalf, till, in the spring of 1852, when Congressmen were soon to be nominated, 70 Members

of the House, fearing the consequences of opposition, absented themselves, and the bill passed. Then went up from some of the old States a cry of opposition. It would draw population from them, leave them to pay the debt incurred in acquiring the public domain, depreciate the value of their lands, for who would buy a farm in North Carolina when he could get one for nothing in Alabama or Missouri, and would tempt the scum of society of the Old World to come and squat on our public domain and scatter seeds of political pestilence on the frontier—and in a little while the agrarian laws of Rome would be re-enacted in America. This wholesale robbery of the old States for the benefit of the new should be denounced by every honest man the land over. Will not the good sense of the Senate strangle this political monstrosity? Besides the injury done to the old States by depriving them of their property in the public lands and draining off their population, the agrarian character of the bill is most objectionable. It is the most flagrant act of depredation on the public domain yet attempted by demagogues. Property and usefulness are the fruits of industry and self-dependence, not of Government bounties and land plundering. There is no way of demoralizing any class more certainly than by means of gratuities. Undoubtedly many citizens would rather have a farm given them than buy it. But they are greatly mistaken if they think they are the people of the United States. The people approve not of such agrarian and Utopian schemes. Congress has no power to dispose of the public land save for national purposes. If it may donate land to the landless, it may give money to the poverty stricken and take the value of 160 acres out of the Treasury and bestow it on each individual of the favored class. Instead of giving land to the homeless, the bill will unsettle the homes of many honest persons who have bought their farms with hard earnings by bringing them into competition with other farms received as an alms by men too indolent and improvident to acquire them as others have.

The CHAIRMAN. And now let me show you, in part, what President Buchanan said in his message vetoing the homestead law, and see if he didn't voice many of the utterances that we have heard against the Mondell bill.

EXTRACTS FROM THE VETO MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT BUCHANAN, JUNE 22, 1860.

I return, with my objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, the bill entitled "An act to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain, and for other purposes," presented to me on the 20th instant.

IV. This bill will prove unequal and unjust in its operation, because, from its nature, it is confined to one class of our people. It is a boon expressly conferred upon the cultivators of the soil. While it is cheerfully admitted that these are the most numerous and useful class of our fellow citizens and eminently deserve all the advantages which our laws have already extended to them, yet there should be no new legislation which would operate to the injury or embarrassment of the large body of respectable artisans and laborers. The mechanic who emigrates to the West and pursues his calling must labor long before he can purchase a quarter section of land, while the tiller of the soil who accompanies him obtains a farm at once by the bounty of the Government. The numerous body of mechanics in our large cities can not, even by emigrating to the West, take advantage of the provisions of this bill without entering upon a new occupation for which their habits of life have rendered them unfit.

That land of promise presents in itself sufficient allurements to our young and enterprising citizens, without any adventitious aid. The offer of free farms would probably have a powerful effect in encouraging emigration, especially from States like Illinois, Tennessee, and Kentucky, to the west of the Mississippi, and could not fail to reduce the price of property within their limits. An individual in States thus situated would not pay its fair value for land when, by crossing the Mississippi, he could go upon the public lands and obtain a farm almost without money and without price.

The people of the United States have advanced with steady but rapid strides to their present condition of power and prosperity. They have been guided in their progress by the fixed principle of protecting the equal rights of all, whether

they be rich or poor. No agrarian sentiment has ever prevailed among them. The honest poor man, by frugality and industry, can, in any part of our country, acquire a competence for himself and his family, and in doing this he feels that he eats the bread of independence. He desires no charity, either from the Government or from his neighbors. This bill, which proposes to give him land at an almost nominal price, out of the property of the Government, will go far to demoralize the people and repress this noble spirit of independence. It may introduce among us those pernicious social theories which have proved so disastrous in other countries.

I am not going to read all of that; but nearly every objection that we have heard urged against this bill is in Buchanan's message vetoing the homestead bill in 1860, and the contention was made then that you should give anybody that did not or could not take up one of these homesteads the equivalent in money out of the Treasury, equivalent to the value of the land.

Mr. ATKESON. And all the arguments given 50 years afterwards have been demonstrated to be true.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it has all been demonstrated to be true?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir. It broke up many people in the East.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the ultimate benefit to the Nation? Wasn't it good?

Mr. ATKESON. Probably so.

The CHAIRMAN. Should we seek the ultimate benefit and good of the Nation, or the temporary benefit and convenience and accommodation of some particular locality?

Mr. ATKESON. No, sir. That isn't the proposition. We take the broad proposition that if a soldier—for instance, I have two nephews. My sister's son is a farmer. The other is the son of a lawyer (and he ran for Congress out there in his State). I don't see why both of those boys shouldn't be given something if you are going to do something for the soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you realize that this committee is a committee of limited jurisdiction? We can't make the entire wearing apparel of a person. We can't make the shoes and tie and collars, but our proposition is simply how to dispose of the land. There are other committees that have jurisdiction of those other matters.

Mr. ATKESON. I have so much stuff here I would like to put into the record, but I am not going to ask you to print it, for it wouldn't be worth while. When I came before the committee the other day I assumed that there wouldn't be anything said against the bill except what I said myself, and was rather disposed to treat it captiously. Since that time I have discovered that there was some other monkey wrenches in this machinery and I was lead to treat it more seriously, and we were trying to get the best which we could furnish the chairman of the committee (we won't ask you to print it in the record) as to the productiveness of some of these schemes.

We want to do any reasonable thing for the soldier, and as was suggested by Judge Boice the other day that you give it to him in pay. I lived through the period following the Civil War down to this, and I had personal friends in both armies and also relatives. I had an uncle that was an officer in the Union Army and a cousin that was in the Confederate Army. The Confederates didn't get any pension and none of them went to the poorhouse that I know of. They were inspired. They knew they had to make a living. They went to work. Their cause was lost and they went on. I could name

dozens and dozens of cases. One case in my neighborhood illustrates the whole bunch almost without exception. I had a man at work on my farm, who is still living, now close to 80 years of age, who was able bodied. He could do twice as much work as I could. He applied for a pension. I laughed at him. His first name was George. I said, "George, if you get that pension you won't work any more." "Oh, yes," he said, he would. He said he would buy him a little farm and do something. A local attorney was looking after the claim, and one day he came to the place at my home and wanted to know where this gentleman was.

I told him he was out in the field husking corn, and he went out into the field where he was. He told him his pension, with quite a little bunch of back money, came in. And he didn't finish husking that shock of corn. He just threw down the last nubbin he had husked. That was nearly 35 years ago, I should say, and he is still living, and he was able-bodied then.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he a private or a brigadier general?

Mr. ATKESON. He was a private. To my certain knowledge he hasn't done a full day's work from that time to this, and I have lived in sight of him all of this time. They become sort of mendicants. They are dependent on the pay, and it took the manhood and nerve of some mighty good men in this country—some things that were done for the boys following the war.

I would like to give these boys a chance. For God's sake let's make it possible for them to stand on their hind legs as respectable citizens. If they want to farm, let's help them. Let the boys get the identical farm that they want. Eliminate this whole colonization scheme. If another boy wants to engage in some other business, I would extend to him some personal-credit plan, predicated on the land-bank scheme, with the ability to set himself up in business wherever he wanted to go. This lieutenant that has just returned, the son of my brother in the West, was halfway through one of the universities in the West taking a course on journalism.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the argument made by Buchanan and others against the old homestead law—give him the value in money of 160 acres of land and let him set himself up in business.

Mr. ATKESON. We are talking about the things in front of us now. That young man will possibly get through the university and his course in journalism. I can't see, for the life of me, if it is a proposition to do something for the soldier, why that boy shouldn't be set up in a newspaper business. I don't mean to give him a plant, but give him some kind of personal credit to enable him to measure up to the position in life that he is trying to attain to. I can't, for the life of me, see why it should be a farm. It is a fact that there has been a good deal said about going back to the farm. Behind this whole propaganda—and I will not make reference to what Judge Boice said, because I own a farm and my son is farming it down in southern Alabama. My people are southern, intensively and all the way around, so I have no local prejudices in the matter whatever. But I can't, for the life of me, see why a man who wants to farm should have the advantage; but behind the whole propaganda are three propositions. I say this advisably, rather regretfully. One thing is to provide immediate employment out of the Federal Treasury to

take up a slack in the labor supply of the country. Another is to provide, if possible, a cheaper food supply for the country. Another is involved in the proposition Judge Boice brought out yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that you deprecate this "back to the farm" propaganda?

Mr. ATKESON. No; I didn't say that I deprecate that. I have no objection to that, if a man wants to go back to the farm. The effort to induce other people to go to the farm by any means possible isn't based on a sound economic policy. Nobody is going to a farm without he thinks he can do better there than anywhere else. That is the last analysis of this whole thing. If it is a question of help, the soldier is to be extended some sort of benefit equally with all the other soldiers, whatever he wants to engage in. If that interferes with my business, he is welcome to it. If it would interfere with somebody else's business, he is welcome just the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had a fair and full hearing—you feel that you have?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; as much as any of the rest of them have. And I am going to stay on this job.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your statements, and I am sure the other members of the committee will.

Mr. ATKESON. We are here to talk this thing over in a friendly way, and I know and you know that the real farmers in this country have not been free to talk and present their views on this matter.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I want to ask you if you have made any calculations as to how much money it would take to set up the 4,000,000 men in business?

Mr. ATKESON. It wouldn't take any of the Government's money. The Government guarantees the bonds, and it isn't in money at all.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. How many failures do you think there will be?

Mr. ATKESON. I don't think there will be any if these lands are judiciously selected and the men who buy them have any skill in cultivating them; and every six months they would have to make a little payment on the land, and the better security they would be.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I know; but we are talking about setting them up in other lines of business now besides the land. Setting them up in other lines.

Mr. ATKESON. That is a matter of personal credit. Depends on the character of the business.

The CHAIRMAN. You would approve a bond sale through the Federal farm-loan bank for that purpose?

Mr. ATKESON. Of course, you wouldn't have the land bank if a man was in business that didn't require land. But I refer to a question of personal credit, that has been agitated over and over.

The CHAIRMAN. The modus operandi is to sell bonds?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; so far as the land is concerned. The bond is predicated on the land and guaranteed by the Government, which makes them as good as the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. You would want the Government to guarantee those bonds?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir; and reserve title to the land till paid for.

The CHAIRMAN. How large a bond issue would that contemplate?

Mr. ATKESON. That depends on how many soldiers want farms.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your idea of them?

Mr. ATKESON. I don't believe 10 per cent of the soldiers want farms.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be 400,000?

Mr. ATKESON. That would be giving them the benefit of the doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. What would it cost per soldier? Have you any idea?

Mr. ATKESON. I would put the limit at \$10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. \$10,000 per soldier? That would amount to \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. ATKESON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Bond issue of \$4,000,000,000 guaranteed by the Government?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you would approve? Don't you know that the Federal farm-loan banks do not guarantee the bonds?

Mr. ATKESON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your idea that they do or do not at the present time?

Mr. ATKESON. They are guaranteed by the banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government does not guarantee them?

Mr. ATKESON. They are not guaranteed by the Government but by the banks.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would be willing to have your bonds for farms for the soldiers guaranteed by the General Government?

Mr. ATKESON. I think you would have to guarantee it by the Government if you issued bonds to cover the entire purchase price, and that is for soldiers only. The Government guaranteeing the bonds at a rate of interest of about what it would cost to handle it.

(Thereupon, at 1.45 p. m., the committee adjourned to meet again Tuesday, June 10, at 10 a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, June 10, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, Mr. Gandy desires to be heard this morning.

**STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY L. GANDY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.**

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I particularly wanted to call to the attention of the committee the legislation along this line which has already been enacted by the State of South Dakota. At the last session of the legislature there was passed an act creating the South Dakota land settlement board.

Mr. SNELL. This past winter, Mr. Gandy?

Mr. GANDY. Yes. There was appropriated an initial amount of \$1,000,000. There was provided a certain tax levy, which will also

raise some funds for the board. I shall ask consent, Mr. Chairman, to incorporate the law as a part of my remarks before the committee.

A careful reading of the law discloses that the legislature had in mind both the individual selection of a farm by the soldier and also the community idea in that the legislature authorized the land board to provide for town sites and churches and schools, if in their opinion the situation made that desirable.

It is provided, first, that the benefits of the act shall apply not only to soldiers of this war but other wars of the United States; second, that the soldier shall make an initial payment of 10 per cent on the land. The board is authorized to make him a loan of \$1,500 for improvements and then it is authorized to make an additional loan of \$1,500 for stock or equipment.

I take it from a reading of the act that if the loan of \$1,500 for improvements is not made, the board can make a loan of \$3,000 for equipment and stock.

There are several classes of lands in South Dakota that this board will be able at once to begin action on and with. First, the State has large tracts of both common school and endowment lands. Then, in the eastern part of the State there are many quarters held by non-residents that perhaps the State will be able to purchase; in the western portion of the State there are many thousands of quarters of Indian lands that may or may not be available, as the board there is able to work with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The law provides that the board shall have full power to enter into contracts, agreements, and memorandums with the United States Government or any of its agencies and cooperate in any way to provide farm homes for returning soldiers.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all I care to say on the act which I want to print as a part of my remarks. If anyone has any questions with relation to it that he desires to ask, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. SNELL. Have they started operating under that act?

Mr. GANDY. I am unable to say as to that. The governor has made the appointments. It is provided that the board shall consist of the governor, the Rural Credits Commissioner, the Commissioner of Immigration, and two other members. The governor has made the appointments. I may say in connection with that also that the State has a State rural-credits system which has loaned to date some sixteen to eighteen million dollars to the farmers of South Dakota. It is getting along very well and has been of very great help to the State.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Gandy, have you sounded the sentiment in your State as to how they feel about this matter and what the situation is there?

Mr. GANDY. I have just been explaining that the State has already enacted legislation very much along the same lines.

Mr. FERRIS. So that your thought is that they are pretty well in agreement on it; is that it?

Mr. GANDY. Oh, yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Have you studied these plans that have been offered by various Members of Congress, some of which have been advocated before this committee, of giving the soldier an outright, fixed

sum as distinguished from an opportunity to earn a homestead? Have you thought of those plans?

Mr. GANDY. Yes; I have.

Mr. FERRIS. What do you think of those plans?

Mr. GANDY. I have been inclined to believe that the greatest good will come from an opportunity to acquire and build up a home, rather than a straight-out loan or gratuity of a certain amount of money.

Mr. FERRIS. What do you conceive to be the objection to a straight-out loan of 100 per cent with which to buy farms wherever they may elect to buy? What are the serious objections to that?

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand you. Did you say straight-out loan or gift?

Mr. FERRIS. Straight-out loan. I do not think anybody has proposed a straight-out gift.

Mr. SNELL. That has been proposed.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Garner proposed it.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, perhaps so; but I am asking about loans. What are the salient objections to a straight-out loan to the soldier so that he can buy a farm wherever he elects to buy one, in your opinion? I ask these questions, I will state to the committee very frankly, because there is a lot of talk about the cloakrooms and hotels by Members who think that is one way to reach this proposition, and what I want to develop is the opinion you have on the subject.

Mr. GANDY. A loan of 100 per cent, permitting the individual to make an individual selection, would certainly have to be very carefully safeguarded or not much good would come from at least a portion of the loan. If the individual has a portion of the money to pay himself, so that he becomes financially interested in it, then I see no objection to permitting him to make an individual selection.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, the bills we have before us contemplate having the soldier pay only 5 per cent, and then these other bills, a good many of them, are to the effect that they should be advanced the entire amount.

Mr. GANDY. I have just stated that the South Dakota law provides that the individual shall pay 10 per cent of the price of the land and 20 per cent of the price of the improvements.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, what is the answer to the proposition being bruited around here that if you require them to pay 5 or 10 per cent, or any per cent, the penniless soldier without anything at all can not avail himself of it, while the man who has some means can take advantage of it. What is the answer to that proposition?

Mr. GANDY. Well, I think under the Lane bill, even the man without anything will be enabled to work out his own salvation. If he is interested to the extent of working it out in that way, he is in no different position than a man has always been in with reference to a homestead. It has been a very serious proposition as to whether a man without any means can get one of these free homesteads that we have talked about for a good many years.

Mr. FERRIS. The problem there is the difference between a man who is fortunate enough to have some means and a man who has no means whatever; and that is a problem that has always been with us.

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

AN ACT Entitled "An act establishing and maintaining by the State of South Dakota a land-settlement board and defining its powers and duties; providing for the purchase and sale of real and personal property and the loaning of money by the State of South Dakota to settlers; authorizing the State of South Dakota to borrow money on its warrants and bonds secured by the good faith and credit of the State for the purposes authorized by this act; providing for the management of said board, and providing for an appropriation of \$100,000 to be used by the land-settlement board for the purposes authorized by this act and for the payment of salaries, expenses, and equipment, and declaring an emergency."

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

SECTION 1. The object of this act is in recognition of military service, to provide useful employment and rural homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines, and others who have served with the armed forces of the United States in the European war or other wars of the United States, including former American citizens who served in allied armies against the central powers and have been repatriated, and who have been honorably discharged; and to accomplish such purpose by cooperation with the agencies of the United States engaged in work of a similar character. This act may be cited as "The South Dakota land-settlement act," and its benefits may be extended to other persons when there are no qualified soldier applicants.

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a South Dakota Land Settlement Board, to consist of the governor, the rural credit commissioner, the commissioner of immigration, and two other members, who will be appointed by the governor, and, unless sooner removed by the governor, shall serve for a term of three and two years, respectively, and to be so selected that the board will not be composed wholly of persons who are members of or affiliated with the same political party or organization. One of the appointed members shall be designated as land-settlement commissioner, and shall be ex-officio secretary and general executive officer of the board, and shall be appointed for a term of three years; shall devote all of his time and attention to the duties of his office; and shall receive a salary of \$3,000 per annum, payable monthly. He shall at the time of his appointment subscribe and file the usual oath and furnish a bond in a sum not less than \$5,000, but at all times sufficient to protect the State against loss, to be approved and filed as are the bonds of other State officers. He shall be custodian of the seal of said board, which seal shall contain the name of the board, and shall keep a record of all its proceedings and all such other books, records, and accounts as are necessary or requisite to keep an accurate record of all the business transacted by the board, and shall do and perform such other duties as may be required of him by said board. The remaining member shall be appointed for a two-year term and receive a per diem of \$6 per day while engaged in discharging his duties as such member. He shall take and subscribe to the usual official oath, and shall furnish an official bond in a sum not less than \$5,000. The attorney general shall be the legal adviser of the board and represent the board in any suits or actions which may arise out of the discharge of its duties.

SEC. 3. Said board shall have authority to acquire, on behalf of the State, such lands in this State as, in its opinion, are suitable for cultivation and improvement, together with any water rights and rights of way desirable or necessary in connection therewith; to improve and sell such lands to approved settlers, giving preference always to soldiers, under the condition prescribed by this act; to set aside for town-site purposes any lands acquired under this act when in the judgment of the board this is desirable; and to subdivide and sell same in lots of such size and with such restrictions as to resale as the board shall determine best; to set aside and dedicate to public use such area or areas as it may deem desirable for roads, schoolhouses, churches, or other public purposes; to improve or to furnish money in the manner herein provided for the improvement or equipment of lands sold to a settler, or upon which the owner has obtained a loan from the State through the South Dakota Rural Credit Board or under the Federal farm loan act, or public lands which have been sold by the State upon deferred payments; to take security upon the lands, improvements, and equipment for lands sold, improvements made, or moneys furnished; to borrow upon the credit of the State not exceeding the sum of \$1,000,000, to be used for the purpose authorized in this act, and to issue warrants or bonds of the State therefor; to expend any moneys appropriated for the use of the board, or which it may obtain by the sale of its securities or otherwise, as herein provided; to cooperate with the Federal Government in providing employment and homes for soldiers and settlers by providing for and encouraging settlement upon lands, and for this purpose to enter into contracts

or agreements with the United States of America; and it shall have the authority to perform all acts necessary to cooperate fully with the agencies of the United States engaged in work of a similar nature; to acquire tracts of land that are susceptible of intensive cultivation by reason of irrigation or otherwise, and to prepare such lands for irrigation and cultivation, and to subdivide and sell the same; to exercise the power of eminent domain on the part of the State for the condemnation of water rights, rights of way for roads, canals, ditches, dams, and reservoirs necessary or desirable for carrying out the provisions of this act; and, on request of the board, the attorney general shall bring the necessary and appropriate proceedings authorized by law for such condemnation; to appropriate water under the laws of the State when such appropriation is necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of this act; to procure such employees as it may deem necessary to conduct the business of the board; to fix the bonds and salaries or compensation of such employees; to define the duties of the officers, agents, and employees of the board; and shall make to the governor annually a full report of its business for the preceding fiscal year, with such general information and recommendations as may to the board seem proper.

SEC. 4. The board, prior to disposing of lands to settlers or at any time after such lands have been disposed of, but not after the end of the fifth year from the date of settler's purchase, may:

(a) Seed, plant, or fence such land and cause dwelling houses and outbuildings to be erected on any farm or make any other improvements necessary to render the land habitable and productive in advance of, or after, settlement, the total cost of such dwellings, outbuildings, and improvements not to exceed \$1,500 on any one farm.

(b) Make loans to approved settlers on personal security or secured by mortgage or mortgages on personal property, but the total amount of any such loan to any individual settler, together with money spent by the board on improvements, as above specified, shall not exceed \$3,000.

SEC. 5. The total amount of money loaned to any one person under the provisions of this act shall in no case exceed the sum of \$10,000.

SEC. 6. Every person whose application has been approved shall enter into a written contract with the board, which shall, among other things, provide that the purchaser shall pay as a cash deposit a sum not less than 10 per cent of the sale price of the farm or tract, and in addition a sum not less than 20 per cent of the cost of improvements made and equipment furnished. The board may at any time require the purchaser to make an application for a loan from the South Dakota Rural Credit Board, or from the Federal farm-loan bank, under the provisions of the Federal farm-loan act, for such amount as may be obtained from these agencies. The balance due on the land may be paid in installments extending over a period to be fixed by the board, not exceeding 30 years, with interest at a rate not less than one-half nor exceeding $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum above the rate actually paid by the board. The amount due on improvements shall be paid in installments extending over a period to be fixed by the board, not exceeding 10 years, together with interest thereon at a rate determined, as above provided. The repayment of loans made on other personal property shall extend over a period to be fixed by the board, not exceeding 5 years. The option may be given any settler to pay any or all installments remaining unpaid at any time.

SEC. 7. The deferred payments for lands sold and the interest thereon shall be paid promptly when due. Whenever the purchaser of any tract shall fail to pay the principal or interest due by him to the State for such tract within three months after the same shall become due, or shall violate any of the provisions of the contract of sale, such contract shall be null and void, and he shall forfeit the amount of purchase money and interest paid on the purchase of said land, and all right, title, and interest in all improvements thereon, and such payments and improvements shall be retained by the State for the same purposes for which the proceeds of sale from such lands are used in full satisfaction and in liquidation of all damages for the use and possession of said property by the purchaser; and the State shall have immediate right to re-enter and take possession of said real estate: *Provided*, That the land settlement commissioner shall serve upon the purchaser or his legal representatives or assigns a notice specifying the conditions in which default has been made, stating that such contract will terminate 30 days after the service of such notice, or at the expiration of three months after the default, if that time has not already expired, unless prior thereto the purchaser shall comply with

such conditions and pay the costs of service. Such notice shall be served personally in the manner provided for the service of summons in civil actions. If the person to be served is not a resident of the State or can not be found therein, of which facts the return of the sheriff of the county where the real estate lies, that he can not be found in such county shall be prima facie evidence, service shall be made by three weeks' published notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the county where the real estate is situated: *Provided*, That personal service of said notice without the State proved by affidavit of the person making the same, made before an authorized officer having a seal, shall have the same effect as the published notice herein provided for. If, within the time mentioned in the notice, the person served complies with such conditions and pays the costs of service the contract shall be thereby reinstated to the same effect as though no default had occurred, but otherwise shall terminate as hereinbefore provided. A copy of the notice, with proof of service thereof, and the affidavit of the land settlement commissioner showing the purchaser has not complied with the terms of the notice, may be recorded with the register of deeds and shall be prima facie evidence of the facts herein stated. The State shall have a first lien on all crops and grains grown upon the land purchased or mortgaged under the provisions of this act for the payment of any investment of interest, principal, taxes, or assessments due or to become due during the calendar year in which such crop is raised.

SEC. 8. When the mortgagor or his successor in interest has fully paid any mortgage, it shall be the duty of the board to furnish him with a proper release or satisfaction of said mortgage executed by the land-settlement commissioner, with an impression of the seal of the board thereon, and the mortgage papers belonging to such loan, including abstract title and insurance policies assigned, shall be returned to such person.

SEC. 9. Whenever warrants or bonds are issued by the board under this act, it shall be the duty of the land-settlement commissioner to submit to the governor a full statement thereof, and a copy shall be filed in the office of the secretary of state as a permanent record. Said warrants or bonds shall be registered in the office of the State treasurer and sold at not less than par. Bonds and warrants may be issued in such denominations, not exceeding \$1,000, as may be determined by the board. The term of said bonds shall in no case be longer than 10 years from the final passage of this act. They shall have interest coupons attached, payable semiannually, and shall be issued in series of not less than \$25,000, the amount, rate of interest, and terms to be fixed by the board. They shall bear on their face the words "Land Settlement Bonds," and the great seal of the State of South Dakota shall be fixed to each bond. All such bonds shall be exempt from any taxes, levies, or impositions made under authority of the laws of this State, and the good faith and credit of the State of South Dakota is hereby pledged for the payment of said bonds and interest thereon as the same becomes due. Warrants may be issued for short-time credit, when the board deems this to be necessary, but the interest rate shall not be greater than 6 per cent per annum, and the board shall endeavor to secure the best interest rate possible on both bonds and warrants. The board shall prescribe rules and regulations concerning the manner in which such bonds and warrants shall be sold, paid, and retired not inconsistent with the provisions of this act. Said bonds and warrants shall be signed by the governor and the land-settlement commissioner and shall be attested by the secretary of state. The total amount of such bonds and warrants shall in no case exceed the sum of \$1,000,000.

SEC. 10. The tax commission of the State of South Dakota is hereby authorized and directed to levy an annual tax, not exceeding one-half of 1 mill, on the assessed valuation of all taxable property in the State, sufficient to pay the interest semiannually and the principal of such bonded indebtedness within 10 years from the final passage of this act.

SEC. 11. Such taxes when collected shall be paid into the State treasury and credited to a special fund to be designated "Land-settlement interest and sinking fund" and applied to the payment of interest on such bonds semiannually, and the final redemption of such bonds and such taxes, when paid into the State treasury, shall remain a specific fund for such purposes, only except as herein-after provided.

SEC. 12. Said land-settlement, interest, and sinking fund may be invested annually in United States bonds or deposited at interest in any bank in the State of South Dakota whose deposits are guaranteed under the depositor's guaranty fund of this State.

SEC. 13. If at any time it shall appear that there will not be sufficient funds in the land-settlement fund in the treasury of the State to pay the bonds, warrants, or interest thereon, when same shall become due, it shall be the duty of the tax commission of this State, upon request of the board, to make a special assessment and levy immediately to pay same, which levy shall be collected in the same manner as other tax levies made by said commission. As soon as such tax levy shall have been made, it shall be the duty of the State auditor, upon request of the board, to issue warrant or warrants, as said board may direct, bearing interest not to exceed 6 per cent per annum, and register same drawn on the fund to be derived from such special levy, in an amount with interest provided in said warrants not exceeding said levy, and deliver the same to said board, and said warrants of the State auditor may be sold by the board. The moneys derived from the sale of such warrants shall be used for the payment of the bonds, warrants, or interest on same issued by the board, for which there were not funds available from which they might be paid. The moneys derived from said special levy shall be placed in a special fund in the State treasury and shall be used only for the redemption of the warrants drawn on said fund, and which shall have been sold, or for the payment of bonds, warrants, and interest thereon issued by the board when same shall become due. All of the moneys derived from said special levy are hereby appropriated for the payment of the warrants drawn on said fund and sold as above provided, or for the payment of the said bonds, warrants, or interest thereon, at maturity.

SEC. 14. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and for the payment of all expenses incurred under its provisions, including salaries per diem, and actual and necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and its employees, the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated. These moneys, together with all other moneys of the board, shall constitute a revolving fund to be known as the "Land Settlement Fund." The moneys hereby appropriated shall be returned to the general fund of the State in such amount and at such times as to said board shall seem advisable. The board may file a voucher approved by the governor and the land settlement commissioner with the State auditor for advances of money to the board needed to meet contingent expenses in such an amount not exceeding \$5,000 at any time as the said board shall deem necessary. It shall then be the duty of the State auditor to issue a direction to the State treasurer, who shall be ex officio treasurer of said board, to set aside in an account the amount required, and the board may thereupon check directly against such account. The checks issued by the board shall constitute the vouchers of the State treasurer in settlement with the State auditor for said sum so set aside. Other disbursements of the board shall be made in the usual way by the presentation of vouchers to the State auditor, who shall thereupon issue his warrant upon the State treasurer for the sums expended, or required to be expended, by such vouchers.

SEC. 15. The board may also lease, or assent to the lease of, any lands pending receipt of application for purchase thereof. The proceeds of all operations under this act shall be covered into the South Dakota land settlement fund.

SEC. 16. Lands acquired pursuant to this act shall be subject to State and local taxation and assessment for improvement purposes from the date of the execution of the contract for the purchase thereof by settlers upon any project undertaken hereunder. If the contracting purchaser shall fail to pay such taxes and assessments, the same may be paid from the fund hereby provided and charged to the purchaser with interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum from date of payment, and shall be a lien on the property assessed.

SEC. 17. No money shall be loaned nor property purchased, under the provisions of this act, after January 1, 1922.

SEC. 18. The board is hereby authorized to perform such acts and make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary and proper to carry this act into full force and effect.

SEC. 19. If any part of this act shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the particular part thereof directly involved in the controversy wherein such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 20. Whereas the passage of this act is immediately necessary for the support of the State government and its existing public institutions, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, and this act shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

**STATEMENT OF MR. BENJAMIN C. MARSH, SECRETARY OF THE
FARMERS' NATIONAL COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, there is a Mr. Marsh here, and Mr. Baer has requested that he be given some time.

Mr. MARSH. May I have about 15 minutes or so, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That has been the limit to members. Will you tell the committee your name, your residence, and whom you represent, Mr. Marsh?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is Benjamin C. Marsh, and I am secretary of the Farmers' National Council, which is a special union for carrying out the reconstruction program of a number of leading farm organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell us something about that organization, how it was formed, and of whom it is composed?

Mr. MARSH. Yes; it was called into existence at a conference on reconstruction held here in Washington last January—a delegate body representing the National Federation of Gleaners, the American Society of Equity, the National Non-Partisan League, and a number of State farmers' unions and State granges. The National Farmers' Union and the National Grange, as such, are not affiliated with this Farmers' National Council, but a number of the State granges are, because, as you gentlemen probably know, the State granges have complete autonomy in their own affairs and on national questions.

The CHAIRMAN. How many attended your meeting? I wish you would go very fully into your organization, Mr. Marsh.

Mr. MARSH. I do not know just what you mean by going fully into our organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us who compose it and who attended, particularly the meeting that you have referred to.

Mr. MARSH. I do not know that I can give you a list of all the members, because there were so many here at this reconstruction conference, but I may go a little further back and say that shortly after the armistice was signed the Farmers' National Headquarters asked these farm organizations to send representatives here to draft a tentative reconstruction program, and they came down here and spent nearly a week, and representatives from several of these organizations drafted this preliminary or tentative program, which was then submitted to the organizations for discussion all over the country, and then this January conference was the outcome of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not get just who sent out this invitation.

Mr. MARSH. The Farmers' National Headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. MARSH. That was started as a combination of several progressive granges, and it has been operating here in Washington for nearly 10 years now. I have been here with it only since a year ago last April, and it has been cooperating—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). What do you mean by progressive granges? Is a progressive grange different from the patrons of husbandry?

Mr. MARSH. The granges which designate themselves as progressive granges—you may know that there was a good deal of discussion in the national granges some years ago on political questions, but

chiefly on economic questions, and there was an organization known as the Progressive State Granges. I might say this, Mr. Chairman, that naturally I am not in complete touch with all the details of that matter, but if you would ask Mr. George P. Hampton, the managing director, I know he would be glad to come here and explain to you the organization. The National Headquarters is distinct from the Farmers' National Council, which I understand is the chief one you have in mind, while, of course, these farm organizations, either out of a clear sky or on their own initiative, or in any way, have the right to come together and adopt a reconstruction program.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the same program that Dr. Atkeson presented here yesterday?

Mr. MARSH. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. He said there was some call for a meeting and that they gathered here and drafted a program of reconstruction, and he presented it to us yesterday.

Mr. MARSH. The National Grange at their last annual meeting, held at Syracuse, N. Y., last November, adopted a reconstruction program which differs in many respects, although we agree on a number of fundamentals, from the Farmers' National reconstruction program.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a copy of your program?

Mr. MARSH. I have a copy of the full program here.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Marsh, before you go into that, let us get this organization straight. Who are the officers in this National Headquarters, and what is their address?

Mr. MARSH. I will give you that.

Mr. FERRIS. Second, I wish you would state just who they represent, and who pays for this headquarters, and pays the salaries of yourself and Mr. Hampton at these headquarters?

Mr. MARSH. I can not give you right off the bat all of the addresses.

Mr. FERRIS. You can give us the organization, and the names of the men who run this national headquarters that you spoke of?

Mr. MARSH. I am very glad to answer these questions, but this should not come out of my 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. No; we will not take it out of your time.

Mr. FERRIS. What I am trying to get, first, is just what this headquarters is, and my reason for asking you these questions is that we have had so many farmers' organizations coming here, and so many have appeared and have such different views that I want to see just who they are each time, and I would like to have the record show the names of the men who run these headquarters that Mr. Marsh represents, and I would like to have the name and address of every organization that they represent and who maintains them here.

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be very glad to give that from memory or submit it in writing, but I would suggest the propriety, since the questions have been raised, of having Mr. George P. Hampton here, and I know Mr. Smith and several others know him, and I would suggest it would be more appropriate to have the managing director, who has been associated with this movement from its inception, answer these questions. I can answer, in a general way, but the details as to contributions, and so forth, would have to come from him. The president is Hon. Herbert F. Baker, Republican State Senator in Michigan, and a leader in the grange movement.

Mr. FERRIS. He is not actively in charge here. Let us have the names of the men actively in charge.

Mr. MARSH. The men actively in charge are the gentlemen who drafted this program.

Mr. FERRIS. Who are they?

Mr. MARSH. That I will have to give you. Mr. Herbert F. Baker was here, and Mr. C. H. Gustafson, president of the Nebraska Farmers' Union, was here, and Mr. Grant Slocum, president of the National Federation of Gleaners, and Mr. J. Weller Long, secretary-treasurer of the American Society of Equity, and there was a long list of 40 people here, and, naturally, I can not give you at the minute all their names and addresses.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did they all sign this pronunciamento?

Mr. MARSH. This was unanimously adopted. They also unanimously adopted a program to carry it out through special committees. Mr. Hampton is managing director of the Farmer's National Headquarters, and was selected to continue as managing director of the Farmers' National Council, and we indulge in the exceedingly democratic method of a referendum on special matters, after adopting this program.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the executives or the officials residing in Washington?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. George P. Hampton and myself, Benjamin C. Marsh. Mr. Hampton is the managing director and I am the secretary. We have frequent conferences. For instance, Dr. Long and Mr. Tittenmore and Mr. Gustafson have been down here several times, one or more of them, since this program was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. When was your last national convention held?

Mr. MARSH. You understand we just organized this Farmers' National Council in January of this year. We have announced to the press that we shall hold a farmers' national conference here in October or at the first session of the league of nations, assuming it meets here in Washington, which seems to be the general understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. How many representatives from the different States attended this organization meeting?

Mr. MARSH. Approximately 40 to 45, but the National Nonpartisan League, for instance, represents a membership of about 250,000, and there are approximately 750,000, although the number is constantly increasing, members of the farmers' organizations which are united for the specific purpose of carrying out this reconstruction program.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what are these farmers' organizations united for the specific purpose of carrying out this program?

Mr. MARSH. I will be glad to repeat them. The American Society of Equity, the National Gleaner Federation, the National Nonpartisan League, the Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Colorado State granges, the Farmers' Union of Nebraska and of North Carolina, which together constitute nearly one-half of the total membership of the National Farmers' Union. They are all cooperating in the program, and there are a number of smaller organizations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Marsh, are you the representative here in Washington of all these organizations?

Mr. MARSH. No; we are the representatives of these organizations on this program. For instance, if matters come up on which we have

not taken any definite action, we do not assume to speak for them except as we may have instructions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you now presuming to speak for all of them on this program?

Mr. MARSH. On this program; yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this committee?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And what you say is the reflection of the views of all these organizations?

Mr. MARSH. It is what we understand to be the reflection of the views of all these organizations.

Mr. TAYLOR. What you say is their sentiment rather than what anybody else has said?

Mr. MARSH. So far as these organizations are concerned, I think I made it clear from the beginning that I do not attempt or assume to speak for the National Grange. They are entitled to their own point of view, but a State grange can adopt, and does adopt, its own program and its own platform, and it disagrees, if necessary, and opposes the position of the National Grange on any national question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Aside from the Grange, you represent here all the other farmers' organizations?

Mr. MARSH. We represent them on this program, as we understand their position.

Mr. FERRIS. That is, the Nonpartisan League, the American Society of Equity, the National Gleaners' Federation—and what other organization?

Mr. MARSH. And some of these State granges and the farmers' unions—some of them, not all of them.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you represent the entire National Farmers' Union?

Mr. MARSH. I said in the beginning that I do not represent the National Farmers' Union.

Mr. WHITE. Did you not rather represent the Farmers' National Council instead of representing all those organizations? You represent, do you not, the Farmers' National Council and its program of reconstruction?

Mr. MARSH. As adopted by these farmers' organization.

Mr. WHITE. You represent the Farmers' National Council?

Mr. MARSH. For instance, to illustrate, when we were down before the Shipping Board conference the other day, Mr. Hurley raised the question, or some one raised the question of whether we were representing the organization we claimed to represent, and Dr. J. W. Long, secretary-treasurer of the American Society of Equity, announced that they did officially indorse this program.

Mr. RAKER. Have you presented your program to the committee?

Mr. MARSH. A summary of this and the program also went to every Member of Congress.

Mr. RAKER. Have you presented it to the committee to-day?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir.

Mr. SNELL. What was your position before you took this position here in Washington?

Mr. MARSH. I am glad to explain that.

Mr. RAKER. Have you put a copy of your program in the record?

Mr. MARSH. I have a brief statement of it here in writing.

Mr. SNELL. What was your business before you took this position here in Washington as the representative of this organization?

Mr. MARSH. Do you mean to ask what my position was?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; what was your business before that time?

Mr. MARSH. I worked about all of my way through college.

Mr. SNELL. I did not mean to go away back there, but what was your position before you took this position here in Washington?

Mr. MARSH. I worked on a farm; and it was there, gentlemen, that I got all my training as a farmer and my insight into the farmers' problems. Then, I lived for 11 years, and until I came down here, in the worst congested and most inhuman city in the world—New York—in slum districts, and I have been in every district in New York. I was interested in coming down here, because I know that it is the effort of the privileged classes to try to pull the farmers and the laborers apart. I knew how important it was to prevent that and to demonstrate the common interest of the farmers and working men in America. In that I do not mean to imply by any means that the farmers are not workers, because I often put in 14 hours a day on the farm. Before that I was for several years in New York the secretary of the congestion committee, secretary of the committee on the high cost of living, secretary of the lower rents society, secretary of the league for municipal ownership and operation of New York City, and secretary of the association for an equitable Federal income tax. I have always managed to do several men's work on one-third of a man's salary.

Mr. SNELL. You have been interested lately in farmers' organizations?

Mr. MARSH. I happen to have met the leaders and to have had correspondence with most of the leaders of the farmers' organizations before I came here, and I am sure you gentlemen will agree with me that in a spirit of self-determination it is entirely up to the farmers' representatives themselves to decide whether or not they like me, and when they do not want me I think it will be within their scope to fire me.

Mr. SNELL. That is not what I was interested in. I was interested to know what your experience had been.

Mr. MARSH. My experience has always been in fighting the privileged interests who carry America around in their vest pockets, and I thought this was a splendid opportunity to come down here right in the center of things, and I cheerfully accepted Mr. Hampton's invitation to come down here.

Mr. SMITH. Would you call yourself an economist?

Mr. MARSH. At college I was regarded as so excruciatingly erudite that I was given the scholarship key, and I attended the graduate school of the Chicago University and of the University of Pennsylvania for four years, but I have been able to live down most of the rot they taught me there. I am not an economist, but I am a student of economics.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been circularizing Congress for the past year or two and have written a number of letters, or are you that same Mr. Marsh?

Mr. MARSH. I am Mr. Marsh, although there may be some other Mr. Marsh.

The CHAIRMAN. In your reconstruction policy and program I find this under subdivision 2, under the head of "Transportation": "The Government should acquire and operate all the railroad systems of the country." Now, I do not want to go into an academic discussion of that matter at all, but is it your contention that the Grange advocates that?

Mr. MARSH. Do you mean the National Grange?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; the National Grange has never gone on record as being in favor of Government ownership and operation. Let me illustrate that: Dr. Atkeson appeared as opposing the Government ownership and operation of railroads, and he made a statement to the committee that if the National Grange asked me to come down here before Congress and try to prove that black was white, I would do my best to prove it. I would not assume to do that, but I would resign first.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care to go into that. I just wanted to know whether or not they did advocate it.

Mr. MARSH. The National Grange has not adopted any resolutions against it. Let me say this, that when the resolution to indorse Government ownership and operation of railroads was introduced at the Syracuse convention of the National Grange last November, instead of having it discussed, the president of the Pennsylvania State Grange moved to table the resolution, but that proceeding hardly gives the national grangers' opinion upon the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, if you please; I do not care to go into the reasons as to why it was or was not adopted. Do you contend that the Grange of the State of Oregon is in favor of Government ownership of railroads?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir. The master of the Oregon State Grange, Mr. C. E. Spence, introduced a resolution in the National Grange favoring Government ownership and operation. I beg your pardon there—it was Mr. Bouck who introduced it and Mr. Spence seconded it.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any record evidence of that, or have you a copy of the resolution?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir; Mr. Bouck introduced the resolution and Mr. Spence seconded it.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would produce those resolutions.

Mr. MARSH. I will ask, Mr. Chairman, again regarding answering these questions that have been raised, that Mr. George P. Hampton, the managing director, may come here and make this statement. Looking over the record, I do not see that these questions were addressed to Dr. Atkeson.

Mr. VAILE. He only purported to represent the National Grange.

Mr. MARSH. Did he tell you how many State granges agreed with him?

Mr. VAILE. I do not think that question was raised. He said he represented the membership of his organization.

Mr. MARSH. May I correct that? Dr. Atkeson knows that he was incorrect in stating that he represents 1,000,000 farmers or 1,000,000 members, because he does not. The membership is only 620,000, and about half are women. A large number of them are not engaged in farming.

Mr. VAILE. He said that a large part of the membership of the Grange was made up of women and minors.

Mr. MARSH. It is not 1,000,000, but it is less than two-thirds of that, including 10 per cent for those who are temporarily in arrears. There are about 750,000 farmers and others, but almost exclusively farmers, in the organizations which unite in this reconstruction program. The National Nonpartisan League is composed entirely of farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. How many farmers did you say indorsed that reconstruction program?

Mr. MARSH. There are about 750,000 in the farm organizations which indorsed it. I have not the result of the poll I am making among masters of State granges and among presidents of State farmers' unions to know how they stand on the question of Government ownership and operation of railroads, but you would be somewhat surprised to know how the sentiment is growing for Government ownership and operation of railroads and of the merchant marine.

Mr. SMITH. Regardless of the increased freight rates?

Mr. MARSH. Let me illustrate that: When we went down to see the president, he stated that he wished he could live on a farm, because he would have more time to think. Now, the farmers have been doing a lot of thinking, and they know that the guarantee of high dividends was what produced the deficiency, and those high dividends were guaranteed, so that the railroad looters among the large financial interests could rehabilitate themselves during this stress of patriotism. They know that the high guaranteed dividends were what increased the freight rates.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one other question: You say that 750,000 farmers indorse this program?

Mr. MARSH. Approximately, but I do not know how many more.

The CHAIRMAN. Your paragraph 7 deals with the restoration of personal liberty, and under that head you say:

The espionage law and all similar laws enacted to render American unified in the war must be repealed and abrogated at the close of the war. All acts of Congress and by State legislatures restricting freedom of speech, freedom of publication, freedom of travel, and freedom of choice of residence, or of occupation, and all executive acts of the President and of the governors of States and Territories, that have their foundation in war needs, must be similarly repealed or terminated. We declare for general amnesty for all political prisoners.

That is one of your plans?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir. In relation to that, I am reminded that the party that kept the espionage act on the statute books after one of our wars died and has never been resurrected since.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Victor Berger one of these political prisoners?

Mr. MARSH. He is a man who is associating with you people here, and I do not think that this is a prison.

Mr. JOHNSON. You do not see me associating with him.

The CHAIRMAN. What political prisoners are referred to here?

Mr. MARSH. I will be glad to submit the view of the Attorney General of the United States on the subject.

Mr. GANBY. Was Haywood one of the political prisoners?

Mr. MARSH. That seems to be a matter the Attorney General attempts to decide. I am inclined to think that although that is a

matter which the Attorney General has attempted to decide, that in fact what constitutes a political prisoner must be a matter for the determination of Congress.

Mr. RAKER. Is Mr. Debbs one of them?

Mr. MARSH. I do not know whether Mr. Debbs is included or not, but I will illustrate further as to what might be political prisoners. A year ago this month the Washington State Grange was broken up on charges of disloyalty. Finally the matter came here. Mr. Hampton was out there, and a long telegram was sent to the President. I know that the Attorney General investigated that case right to the bottom, and found that there was not the slightest evidence against them.

Mr. RAKER. That is your view.

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; it was not my view, but it was the view of the Attorney General of the United States, who would not institute any proceedings against them.

Mr. RAKER. They were not prosecuted?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; I did not say they were prosecuted.

Mr. RAKER. They could not be political prisoners unless they are held.

Mr. MARSH. They were trying to do the usual thing, and you gentlemen realize deep down in your own hearts that every predatory interest in America tried to railroad to jail every farmer and laboring man who favored a real economic democracy here in America. You gentlemen know that as well as I do.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, would it not be a good idea to get his views on the bill?

Mr. MARSH. You are welcome to all of my views on all these subjects. I wish I could print that in every paper in the United States.

Mr. SUMMERS. In regard to the breaking up of the State grange meeting in the State of Washington last year, I would like to say that that meeting was held in a high school building, under permission granted for the holding of the State grange meeting. There came about a very decided division in that grange as to whether or not the nonpartisan league principles should be there advocated, and speakers for the nonpartisan league were there introduced and it became quite largely a nonpartisan league meeting. For that reason the school board said that they must vacate the building.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, permit me to question the accuracy of the gentleman's information. Mr. Hampton, who was there and who handled the case for them—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). We do not care to go into that matter at length.

Mr. MARSH. I thought, perhaps, there had been some sort of misapprehension, I wish you would let me finish with the rest of these questions, because I submit it is not fair to not allow me to complete my answer.

The CHAIRMAN. You have gone into the bill—

Mr. MARSH (interposing). I beg pardon, you gentlemen have raised matters that are utterly irrelevant to it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have covered the matter.

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; I respectfully ask the right to go on.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have; and you may proceed now upon the bill. You may proceed now to discuss the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Let me ask him a question, Mr. Chairman, before he proceeds. Have you here in the room the program that your people are desirous of carrying out, and which you claim is opposed to the contemplated legislation for providing homes for soldiers? Have you that program here in writing?

Mr. MARSH. I have the printed program here.

Mr. RAKER. Let me have it.

Mr. MARSH. I want to read a little section of it.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to have this program made a part of the record, and that the gentleman be given an opportunity to discuss the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

RECONSTRUCTION POLICY AND PROGRAM OF AMERICAN FARMERS.

Officially and unanimously adopted at the farmers' national conference on reconstruction in America and international reconstruction held at the National Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 7, 8, and 9, 1919. The conference was attended by representatives of the American Society of Equity, the National Gleaner Federation, the National Non-Partisan League, several State granges, State farmers' unions, the stock growers', wheat growers', and dairymen's associations, with a total membership of 750,000, and a number of smaller organizations. Six weeks prior to the assembling of the conference a special joint committee of the leading farm organizations met at the farmers' national headquarters, Washington, D. C., and drafted a tentative reconstruction program. This tentative program was published extensively in the farm press and submitted to the farm organizations for discussion, and made the basis of instructions to the delegates to the official conference.

This program thus carefully considered includes the chief measures which united farmers will seek to have adopted as the permanent policy of the country. It can accurately be designated: "The fighting reconstruction program of the forward-looking farmers of America."

I. FOR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN AMERICA.

The World War has brought up for solution modern problems of production and distribution of food and farm staples. We farmers have realized to the full the important rôle which we must play in war as well as in peace. We have responded in measure up to our capacity. But with the coming of peace these problems are not settled, but are accentuated. During the war we have voluntarily governed our activities in conformity with the wishes of our Commander in Chief, solidly standing by our country in its hour of need, feeding our armies and our allies, even though the dislocation of labor conditions compelled superhuman effort to do it.

It is impossible for us to organize in militant fashion for our own defense. Nothing could justify a threat on our part to refuse to produce and thereby inflict hunger, and we are therefore justified in demanding of the Government, of which we are no inconsiderable part, definite action that will lead to greater production and to cheapened distribution.

Not all of our institutions could stand the strain or meet the exigencies of war, however, and our Government was compelled to take over, operate or control, many agencies of production and distribution of food, namely, railroads, shipping, express, telephone, telegraph, mills, elevators, packing houses, cold storage, and wholesale and retail dealers—a degree of governmental interference necessary to compel these agencies to function successfully in the crisis, varying from complete Government ownership and operation to licensing with strict supervision. By these means a wise statemanship prevented hunger and defeat in the war. Wheat is not ready for consumption when it leaves our hands. The wool is not ready to wear as it leaves the ranch; the meat is not ready for the table as it leaves the stall or sty. It is necessary to use the mill, the elevator, the factory, the railway, the packing house, and cold storage

before these products are prepared for human consumption. The transfer of the ownership of these commodities on their way from the producer to the ultimate consumer goes through banks, chambers of commerce, commission houses, wholesale and retail stores. These, then, are the channels of trade through which our products flow from the producer to the consumer. Monopoly control of these channels is a constant menace to the welfare of our people and of the world. These channels must be public or subject to public control, or no economic freedom can exist. It is to the mutual advantage of both producer and consumer to have open access to these channels of trade. The unrestrained greed of the private owners of these channels threatened disaster to our arms and those of our allies, through their excessive tolls. Government control, and in many instances Government ownership and operation, was necessary to allow the flow of trade to continue. Idle cars by thousands encumbered our railways while lack of cars threatened our industries and our homes with shortage of coal and food. Our supplies were ample and to spare, but we could not move them to the consumer. Commission houses and speculators at times joined hands to make available food so scarce that our workers could not buy it, while we who produced by endless toil could not sell it to them at any price. Packing houses and cold-storage concerns hoarded our supplies while refusing to pay sufficient wages to employees to enable them to live and maintain the necessary physical vigor to carry on their work, or to purchase at reasonable prices the food we raised for them.

The Government wisely came to the rescue, and happily the difficulties peculiar to the world crisis were in a degree overcome. But with the coming of peace the problems are no less serious and no less difficult of solution. Labor conditions have been dislocated by the war. Commercial conditions affecting farm produce have been turned upside down and inside out by the necessary price-fixing of some commodities and stimulation of production of others. The destination of huge quantities of farm and manufactured products must now be changed and the channels of trade opened anew in other direction. Millions of men and women with the will to do their share of the world's work must divert their energies from war work, now unnecessary, to tasks of peace. Happily we have vast stores of natural resources upon which they may expend their labor in producing those things which keep the wheels of industry turning. The world want, created by the war, provides ample demand for the product of their toil. It was important that all be fed during the war; it is no less important now. Sound statesmanship will prevent the clogging of the channels of trade now, as well as in war, and we therefore demand as a minimum program for reconstruction the following measures, the efficiency of which have been demonstrated during the war:

1. *Natural resources.*—The natural resources of the country, now in public ownership—coal, iron and copper ores, water power, timberlands, phosphate deposits, potash, gas, oil, etc.—are worth hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a solemn obligation devolving upon the country not to alienate any more of these natural resources either by patent or by lease, but to develop and hold them in trust for this and succeeding generations. Such of these natural resources as are now in private ownership should be acquired by the Government at the earliest possible opportunity, payment to be only for actual and prudent investment.

2. *Transportation.*—Within 21 months following the close of the war, at the expiration of which the railroads would otherwise be returned to their present owners, the Government should acquire and operate all the railroad systems of the country, and within the same period acquire and operate pipe lines and express companies, and the Government should operate all inland water transportation so that we may have a unified system of transportation of passengers and freight as a Government service. This service should be rendered at cost, with the single view of reducing cost of transportation, securing fair treatment of those employed, and facilitating the development and expansion of domestic manufacturing, and of domestic and foreign commerce. In making payment for railroads and other means of transportation, the guaranteed payment during war time should not be made a precedent, and the people should pay the owners thereof only for prudent investment.

Enormous sums have been expended by the Government in constructing ships. The ships so constructed at Government expense should remain the property of the people of the country and should be operated as a merchant marine for the benefit of the people as a whole with due regard to terms and conditions of employment.

3. *Packing plants.*—The revelations by the Federal Trade Commission of the monopolistic control which the "Big Five" packers have established in the business of the manufacture and preparation of meat their effort to control the entire food supply of the country, and their entrance into allied and unrelated lines of business—an exposure revealing the direct connection and vital identity of interests of the packers and the big financial interests of the country—make it clear that the privileges which have enabled the packers to build up such a monopoly must be immediately terminated. The four following recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission to deal with the packing situation should be adopted as the permanent policy of the country.

That the Government acquire:

"(1) All rolling stock used for the transportation of meat animals and that such ownership be declared a Government monopoly.

"(2) The principal and necessary stockyards of the country to be treated as freight depots and to be operated under such conditions as will insure open, competitive markets, with uniform scale of charges for all services performed, and the acquisition or establishment of such additional yards from time to time as the future development of live-stock production in the United States may require. This to include customary adjuncts of stockyards.

"(3) All privately owned refrigerator cars and all necessary equipment for their proper operation and that such ownership be declared a Government monopoly.

"(4) Such of the branch houses, cold-storage plants, and warehouses as are necessary to provide facilities for the competitive marketing and storage of food products in the principal centers of distribution and consumption. The same to be operated by the Government as public markets and storage places under such conditions as will afford an outlet for all manufacturers and handlers of food products on equal terms. Supplementing the marketing and storage facilities thus acquired, the Federal Government establish through the Federal Administration, at the terminals of all principal points of distribution and consumption, central wholesale markets, and storage plants with facilities open to all upon payment of just and fair charges."

Slaughterhouses should be constructed near sources of supply and municipal slaughterhouses in all important cities.

4. *Demobilization.*—To secure the transition from a war basis to an economically sound and ethical peace basis of industry, we believe the following measures are essential:

(a) Every nation of the world, at least our own nation and those with which we have been associated in this war, should immediately make an inventory of its stocks of essential goods on hand, to ascertain in what industries maximum production is essential, and priority of material, transportation, fuel, and labor should be accorded to these industries.

(b) Those now engaged in industries directly connected with the war should be transferred to the industries essential in peace as rapidly as possible, and plants now engaged in war industries should be converted to peace purposes, while semiessential industries classed as nonessential during the war should be encouraged to maximum production.

(c) In view of the world's shortage of foodstuffs, men in the Army and Navy training camps in this country and soldiers abroad who have had experience in farming and those essential to the transportation and distribution of farm products should be discharged first and provision made to secure them employment in agriculture at the earliest possible moment. Men not experienced in farming but who wish to farm should be encouraged to do so by the adoption of a system similar to that which has proven so successful in the settlement of soldiers in the Province of Ontario through the provision of training for agriculture, with adequate payment during such period.

(d) Men in the Army and Navy who do not wish to enter in schools established for that purpose should be given vocational training until such time as they can be absorbed by the peace industries of the country. Men in the service overseas should be similarly trained and discharged by industries as industrial opportunity develops.

(e) Federal, State, and local governments should also immediately plan construction of public improvements in order of urgency, so that when due to industrial or economic crises any large number of men or women are unemployed they may find work at fair rates on governmental undertakings. Extension of railroads, reclamation work, reforestation, and land clearing and preparation, the development of highways, waterways, and other public works should be

similarly planned in order of urgency to prevent the unemployment which would otherwise follow the end of the war.

5. *Agriculture.*—Though this country has the best natural opportunities for agriculture in the world, farming has been the most unprofitable industry in the country. The farmer and the farmer's family have not shared appreciably in the increasing wealth of the country to which they have contributed the largest share. They have toiled longer hours and more arduously than any other class of workers in the country, but with meager financial returns. They have always taken heavy risks and gambled with nature, with the possibility of small gains and the probability of large losses.

Among the essentials to place farming on a sound basis are the following:

(a) The establishment of a sound and economical method of marketing farm products. Existing wasteful methods of distributing farm products belong to an outworn age. Thousands of unnecessary middlemen intervene between the producers and the consumers of farm products. These must be eliminated, and direct, free, and open channels established—either through cooperation or direct Government operation—all the way through, from farm producer to ultimate consumer. Municipal slaughterhouses, warehouses, and cold and common storage warehouses must be established in large centers of consumption as a part of this system of distributing farm products, while centralized wholesale and retailing plants must be established under municipal ownership or control.

(b) Credit must be made as available and as cheap to farming as to any other legitimate and responsible industry. The farm-land banks, while serviceable in this direction, fail in large measure to make increased production possible. Like collateral loans in commercial banking practice, they rely for security upon existing values, and fail to aid in productive operations in the way that the banks through commercial loans aid in production and distribution. A farmer owning high-priced land is not the man in most urgent need of Government assistance, but rather the man endeavoring to produce from land of initial small value crops that require intensive cultivation and sometimes the lapse of years.

The need of such credit can not be met by mortgage security. The funds should be available through regional agencies, wherein cooperative guaranties are secured for repayment in due season.

Without such a system vast areas of our country must lie idle except as they are redeemed by the application of great sums of private capital, which are seldom available, and, even if available, lead to tenancy rather than to independent operation. Land-mortgage credit can never benefit existing tenants, any more than it can result in adequate development of productive possibility.

(c) The present unrestrained system of land tenure must be terminated. Vast holdings of productive fertile lands in a single ownership is detrimental to all legitimate agricultural interests. Tenant farming should be replaced by the more responsible system of cultivation by owners. Taxation should be used as a remedy to force into productivity idle acres held for speculation.

(d) Terminal elevators should be considered a part of a Government owned or controlled transportation system. They should be made the means of affording service to farmers and consumers. Even if segregated from the transportation systems, they should be either controlled in the interest of public service or should be subject to direct public ownership and operation. Their past history has too often shown them to be a power used for speculation and oppression. This must be ended.

(e) We as farmers appreciate that in a great measure the responsibility for carrying out this program rests upon us. We commend the various farm organizations for the work already done.

It is only by organization with complete coordination of organized effort that success will crown our work.

We believe that the foregoing measures will aid the farmers in their indispensable task; that they will break monopoly control and end unearned profits from speculation in farm products; and that they will effect a reduction in the costs of living that will enable productive consumers to maintain and to raise their present standard of living.

6. *War finance.*—The enormous outlay necessary for winning the war will have increased the interest-bearing national debt twenty to twenty-five fold. The ending of the war has incited those who profited enormously by these war expenditures to seek to avoid the payment of their fair share of its costs. The making of large profits was inevitable under the stress of war times. The

test of democracy is whether those who have profited so enormously from the necessities of their fellow beings and from Government expenditures shall be compelled to pay back the major portion of their excess war profits as taxes, and whether the few who before the war owned a large proportion of the wealth of the country shall equally pay their share of war costs. America's wealthiest and most privileged seek to escape their share of these costs. We demand that the rates of taxation on excess and war profits, incomes, and inheritances which have in a measure been imposed, as urged by the Nation's workers for the war period, shall be levied until the full cost of the war has been paid, in order that the farmers and other workers of the country may not be compelled to carry the financial burden, as they have borne the major part of the toil and effort in the winning of this war, and that to this end there be applied remedial taxes that will force into use unused lands and other resources now speculatively held.

7. *Restoration of personal liberty.*—The espionage law and all similar laws enacted to render America unified in the war must be repealed and abrogated at the close of the war. All acts of Congress and of State legislatures restricting freedom of speech, freedom of publication, freedom of travel, and freedom of choice of residence or of occupation, and all Executive acts of the President and of governors of States and Territories that have their foundation in war needs must be similarly repealed or terminated. We declare for general amnesty for all political prisoners.

8. *Labor and wages.*—The dislocation of industry necessarily occasioned by the whole-hearted commitment of this country to the sole purpose of winning the war presents problems requiring careful governmental action. The principle must be fully established and universally recognized that labor is the first fixed charge upon all industry, taking precedence of the claims of property and investment in business and commerce. This is essential to securing the well-being of our people, and the industrial and economic democracy for which our men have striven. Living wages to those engaged in industry, commerce, trade, mining, railroading, and in all other legitimate activities, are a direct benefit to farmers because they increase the purchasing power of those so engaged, and not only increase the efficiency of these workers, but provide the most economic and advantageous market for farm products—a home market.

9. *Equal suffrage.*—We urge passage by the United States Senate of the pending Susan B. Anthony amendment of the Constitution giving full suffrage to women.

10. *Education.*—Education is the basis of all progress. Rural education sets the solid standards of our citizenship and our patriotism. It is here the ideals of American Government find their bulwark. New and higher standards of citizenship must be set up in our rural schools to meet the test of the new international ethics that herald a new dawn for all humanity. Only as the rural citizen of the future learns his true relationship to industry as a whole, to his own country, and to his fellowmen in other countries, can we hope for the solid upbuilding of our rural life which is the mainstay of our civilization. As measures calculated to bring about this result we favor:

(a) Raising the standards of teachers through higher wages and special courses of instruction for rural teachers.

(b) Introducing democracy by organizing into self-governing bodies as far as possible all rural schools, the children learning government by governing themselves.

(c) Teaching agriculture from an inspirational viewpoint.

(d) Federal aid in scholarships for rural teachers.

(e) Teaching industrial history, and farm economics, and marketing.

(f) Teaching a broader patriotism based upon the establishment of justice in all relationships of industry and commerce, both national and international.

(g) Teaching organization, cooperation, and cooperative methods.

11. *Compulsory military training.*—We are unalterably opposed to the establishment of militarism in America by a system of compulsory militaristic training. The disciplinary and physical benefit of such training can be secured by the organization of physical training in our schools.

12. *Use of troops in enforcing internal reform.*—We demand that American troops should not be used to fasten on any people any form of government. We call upon our Government to formulate a plan for the speedy withdrawal of foreign troops from Russia and to proffer to the Russian people all possible aid and assistance to enable that nation to evolve a stable government and to attain just economic, industrial, and social conditions.

13. *Public health.*—We urge adequate financial support by Congress for the necessary extension of the work of the United States Public Health Service; provision for a greatly increased number of public health nurses in rural districts, such service to be noncompulsory.

14. *International congress of farmers.*—We indorse and approve the idea of an international congress of farmers to sit at the same time and place as the official peace conference to consider their mutual interests in:

- (a) Peace terms.
- (b) Production of food.
- (c) International marketing.
- (d) Closer relations and better understanding between the tillers of the soil in all countries.

II. FOR INTERNATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION.

The war to end war has been won. The right of all peoples, large and small, weak and strong, to maintain unmolested by external intervention their own standard of democracy has been established. The world has learned by the tragic suffering of over four years of armed conflict that political, financial, commercial, industrial, and imperial autocracy must end; that these several manifestations of autocracy inevitably produce war. The world has paid the price to win freedom for all peoples for all time. We must admit that causes tending to war exist in every country. The approach of the peace conference challenges the democratic forces of the world to evolve a plan of cooperation between the peoples of the world which, by ending the causes of war, shall make another war impossible. The farmers of America implicitly follow the world's leading Democrat, President Woodrow Wilson, in his determination to make this the world's last war by the application of the principles which alone will prevent war. War is always an economic loss—scarcely less serious to victor than to vanquished. We hold the following to be essential to prevent wars between nations in the future:

1. Recognition of the common interests of the working people of all countries, regardless of the form of political government under which they live.
2. International control over international trade and international investment.
3. Freedom of production, and uniform and equally free exchange between all peoples.
4. Termination of all secret treaties and understandings between nations.
5. Gradual reduction of armaments.
6. International control over the occupation and development of backward countries, subject always to the right of small and backward peoples to self-determination.
7. Complete and direct control by the peoples of every established country of their own government.
8. Unrestricted passage for legitimate commerce over land and sea.
9. War must be made democratic by the agreement of all nations to declare war only by the majority vote of all, men and women.

Wars in the future can be made impossible only by securing just economic conditions and relations within nations as well as between nations. The people of every nation, earnestly desiring that this war shall not have been fought in vain, must democratize their governments if they would do their part to insure the establishment of permanent world peace. But each nation must determine its own freedom by its own efforts without the intervention of other nations. Only for the regulation and control of international relations have nations the right to combine to prevent future wars, and then only to insure the establishment of democracy between nations on the solid basis of equal rights for all and special privileges for none. As democrats of the soil and guardians of the rights of producers we feel it to be our solemn duty to present to the peace conference and democrats throughout the world this program, the adoption of which American farmers believe will insure the establishment of international relations on a sound, economic, and just basis, and make war through international misunderstandings impossible.

The league of nations.—Among the instrumentalities of the league we believe the following to be essential:

1. An international investment board. Foreign investments have been a prolific source of misunderstanding between nations and if unregulated will in the future lead to conditions that may make war unavoidable. We therefore advocate the establishment of an international investment board whose functions shall be as follows:

(a) To prevent the investment of money of one nation in another unless justified by conditions and agreeable to the nation receiving the investment.

(b) To adjust conflicting claims among nations as to "spheres of influence."

(c) To prevent the use of force by any nation to protect or to promote the investment of its nationals, and to determine methods of securing justice to foreign investors.

2. An international board of trade. Tariffs are constantly disturbing factors and if any nation enacts a tariff law, it should operate between all nations alike and with absolute equality. To facilitate international trade under fair conditions to all peoples we advocate the establishment of an international board of trade, whose functions shall be:

(a) To furnish market places open to all nations and operated for service alone.

(b) To report market quotations and market information of the markets of the world.

3. An international commerce commission to control international freight rates, and to enforce its rules by judgments enforceable in the courts of the country of the offenders. There must be joint use of coaling stations and of canals over which the international commerce commission would have jurisdiction.

4. An international institute of agriculture. The international institute of agriculture of Rome, Italy, should be brought under the jurisdiction of the league of nations and made a part thereof. The importance of this institution is now well understood. As a department of the league of nations its functions and powers should be enlarged, as now recommended by its general assembly and permanent committee.

5. An international labor board, to have such functions and powers, consistent with the democratic purpose of the league of nations, as the organized labor forces of the member nations may desire.

Abolishment of secret diplomacy.—All treaties not made public should be abrogated, and no treaty should be considered binding until made public, while diplomacy in the future must be carried on through frank and open discussion.

Reparation, not revenge.—Unjust and revengeful financial punishment must not be inflicted upon the Central Powers. Such action would sow the seeds of a future war, inviting prewar conditions which made this war inevitable. We indorse the statement of President Wilson on this point and affirm that in determining the restoration to be made by the Central Powers we must avoid the principle of revenge, and insist that only the principle of reparation for wrongs done by the Central Powers be enforced. Except as a means of securing peace and justice in the future, we are opposed to economic boycotts and reprisals.

Armies and armaments must be reduced.—Confident of the soundness of our position that this must be made the last war, we urge our fellow workers in all countries throughout the world to join with us in demanding that there be a reduction of armies and navies, and that all countries signing the treaty of peace shall agree to abolish compulsory military training, and adopt as a substitute for such military training such physical, industrial, and agricultural training as will promote the health and efficiency of their peoples. No matter what the offense of one country, large or small, may be in the future, such country must be punished not by the physical forces of other nations within its own territory but by an economic boycott of all the associated peoples of the world, to continue while the violation of international justice continues, and to cease when the offending country makes due and adequate reparation. We advocate only such an international police force, subject to the control of the league of nations, as shall keep the offending people within its own territory and protect others from any injury through invasion of their territory, or destruction of life or property on the high seas.

Position of German colonies.—The colonial possessions taken from Germany should be internationalized, and free trade with them established, or they should be governed by an international parliament until they are qualified for self-government.

Supplementing the activities outlined above and in order to advance understanding and good will among the peoples of all nations, especially those engaged in the same line of industry, we believe the league of nations should foster the holding of international conferences of farmers, organized workers, manufacturers, merchants, bankers, etc. Through frequent international conferences of this nature most of the national misunderstandings that hitherto have been such prolific sources of trouble would be things of the past and be replaced by mutual understanding and respect.

The people of all nations are looking with prayer on their lips and hope in their hearts to the peace conference to deal justly with our enemies and complete their labors, of such vital importance to the world, by providing for the establishment of a league of nations on a foundation economically and ethically democratic. Only as this is accomplished can government of the people, for the people, by the people spread o'er the earth and wars be made impossible.

We, therefore, on behalf of the farmers of America, after careful thought, investigation, and consideration have herein presented the positive convictions of the producers of America as to the essentials of a democratic solution of our international problems, and submit them to the peace conference and the democratic people of the world.

Mr. MARSH. I was going to say that the farmers' national conference has not taken definite and specific action upon this specific bill, one reason, of course, being the fact that it was not introduced at the time, but I am going to discuss it, with your permission, from the point of view of the general program, and make certain suggestions in relation thereto. My first suggestion—and if it is not appropriate, you will strike it from the record—is that the Secretary of Labor, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Agriculture be invited to appear before this committee to discuss these questions in relation to this bill. Taking up the printed program, I will try to make clear the reasons for my suggestion. We suggest in section 4, under the head of "Demobilization," that—

Federal, State, and local governments should also immediately plan construction of public improvements in order of urgency, so that when due to industrial or economic crises any large number of men or women are unemployed they may find work at fair rates on governmental undertakings. Extension of railroads, reclamation work, reforestation and land clearing and preparation, the development of highways, waterways, and other public works should be similarly planned in order of urgency to prevent the unemployment which would otherwise follow the end of the war.

Then, under the head of "Agriculture," in subsection (c) we say—

The present unrestrained system of land tenure must be terminated. Vast holdings of productive fertile lands in a single ownership is detrimental to all legitimate agricultural interests. Tenant farming should be replaced by the more responsible system of cultivation by owners. Taxation should be used as a remedy to force into productivity idle acres held for speculation.

Now, we feel that there are certain features of this bill and of the principles involved that we all naturally subscribe to—that is, that we must do the right thing by our returning soldiers. I have talked with Mr. Mondell upon the general purposes of this bill, and he said that we must be practical. I said, "Mr. Mondell, the Republican and Democratic Parties have been practical since the Civil War, and, as a result of their practicality"—this is the substance of my words—"every rich man in America, in the richest country in the world and with the best opportunities, is shaking in his boots from fear of Bolshevism, which happens only when the privileged interests govern." Now, would it not be proper for both parties—and I do not belong to either—would it not be proper for both parties to question whether they have been so practical as a result of their joint control of domestic affairs since the Civil War that we are threatened with the menace of Bolshevism? It is remarkably strange that in a country with these vast resources, with our 875,000,000 acres of farms, we should have any problem whatsoever in reabsorbing in our principal industries, manufacturing and agriculture, the returning soldiers?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am interested in what you are saying, and I want to ask you whether you think this country is threatened with Bolshe-

vism now? I am interested in it, and I am asking this for information.

Mr. MARSH. You are asking me a question, and I am here as the representative of farmers, but if I may give you a personal opinion—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). That is what I want.

Mr. MARSH. My personal opinion is this, and I have watched conditions pretty closely since I got out of college—that the Bolsheviki of Wall Street and the land speculators have run the Government so long that we are now threatened with the inevitable result of their conduct of it. I think the Bolsheviki of privilege who run things in America are one thousand times greater in influence and a great deal more vicious than the Bolsheviki in Russia. I am not alarmed over the threat of Bolshevism, because I think the American people have too much good common sense. I think that John D. Rockefeller's conduct of the Colorado Coal & Iron Co. is a more stupid thing and a more vicious thing than what the bomb-throwing anarchists have attempted. If you permit the espionage law to remain on the statute books—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). We have no jurisdiction over the espionage law.

Mr. MARSH. Don't you have a vote?

The CHAIRMAN. This committee has no jurisdiction over that subject, and we can not go into these collateral matters.

Mr. MARSH. You have gone into a number of collateral matters this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. There are certain matters before this committee and of which we have jurisdiction.

Mr. MARSH. As I was saying, we would have no difficulty in reabsorbing into the manufacturing industries and into agriculture the men whom we are going to discharge, or who are being discharged, from all branches of our service, if we had had a reasonably efficient and humane organization before the war started of both manufacturing industries and agriculture. The war compelled us to pay the penalty for the past half century of what Herbert Croly describes in "The Spirit of American Life" as individual aggrandizement and collective irresponsibility; so that now some 23,000 people own one-fourth of the whole wealth of America, and so that there are individual landholders who own over 1,000,000 acres.

I just want to summarize from the Statistical Abstract the proportion of the land in farms by sections. It is given here for every State in the Union, but I want to give it by sections, that is, the proportion of land in farms to-day that are improved. Of course, the percentage I will read is the improved, and the balance is the unimproved.

Mr. ELSTON. Can you not just have that go into the record by referring to the page, without reading it?

Mr. MARSH. Yes; it is on page 132 of the Statistical Abstract for 1917. I want to call your attention particularly to the fact that, taking the country as a whole, only about one-half of the land in farms in 1910 was improved.

Now, gentlemen, here is the way the Secretary of the Interior described some of this work of reclamation. This is his last annual report the press report, page 115. He cites the fact that there are 228,-

500,000 acres of cut-over lands, and I quote liberally: "In their present state these 228,500,000 of cut-over lands are a picture of desolation calculated to discourage the hardiest pioneers." Then in the name of justice and patriotism, why do you want to make the soldiers who have risked their all go there while the millionaires hold their millions of acres of fertile and idle land out of use and get richer and richer and richer?

I will tell you a little story I told when Mr. Lane was present. It illustrates my position and I think the farmer's position on this proposal. There was a fellow in a hospital who was going to die, and the chaplain was away, and the orderly served as chaplain, and the orderly came to this Tommy and said, "Tommy, you have been a sinner." "Yes," he said, "I know it." "Tommy, you have been an awful sinner, and you are going to hell." "Well," says Tommy, "maybe I am; it is too bad." "Well," says the orderly serving as chaplain, "You ought to be damn thankful that the good Lord has provided some place you can go to when you die." The soldiers are not going to take that attitude toward this proposition, gentlemen.

I have talked down at Camp Meade, and down at the barracks here to thousands and thousands of soldiers during the past year, and I have told them about our program, and I never met a more enthusiastic crowd, and I have talked in Madison Square Garden, and Carnegie Hall, and a number of other big halls throughout the country, and I have never had a more enthusiastic response than to the proposition that the soldier is entitled to something else besides what is left that nobody else wants.

MR. SNELL. Under whose auspices did you speak to the soldiers?

MR. MARSH. Under the auspices of the Y. M. C. A., by request, and I will tell you that it was hard work, too. I did not get home until midnight after a busy day's work.

MR. SUMMERS. You understand that Secretary Lane refers to these lands in their present condition in his picture of desolation?

MR. MARSH. In their present condition; yes.

MR. JOHNSON. Mr. Marsh, you do not mean to convey the impression that your statement, as you have just made it here, expresses the idea and opinion of the Y. M. C. A. as an organization when you state that you spoke under their auspices.

MR. MARSH. Do you find much regard for the Y. M. C. A. upon the part of the soldiers?

MR. JOHNSON. Yes, sir; I do.

MR. MARSH. I do not, as a whole.

MR. WHITE. So do I.

MR. JOHNSON. I find a great deal.

MR. MARSH. I find it for those who are willing to go to the bottom of things; but, gentlemen, the time for dealing with the superficialities of life is past. You can read about 40 of the President's speeches to that effect, and you can read many other things along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Marsh, you have seven minutes left in which to develop your plan.

MR. MARSH. Well, of course, I want to answer the questions that are asked as I go along.

MR. VAILE. I do not want to interrupt Mr. Marsh's statement, but when he gets through I want to ask him one or two questions.

Mr. MARSH. I am much obliged, because it is a little hard for me to take up the thread when I drop it. Mr. Lane points out also that there are 80,000,000 acres, roughly, of swamp lands, of which nearly 53,000,000 acres are permanent swamp lands.

Gentlemen, to come down to what should be done, Australia, particularly New Zealand, I understand, and Canada have suggested buying lands for the soldiers, but they have done this: They have levied in most of the Provinces of Australia and Canada an additional tax on land values, so that the Government will not have to pay the enormously inflated price which you are going to be required to pay when the Government goes into the business of buying lands for soldiers. That always happens. I never knew, or at least I do not recall, a single case where the Government has been able to buy lands for anything like their assessed value or for twice their assessed value ordinarily. Down in Australia they have this law, that the owner of lands must set his price, and he has either got to sell to the Government at 10 per cent advance on the price he sets on his land if the Government wants to buy it or he is going to be taxed on the appraisal or valuation he has put on the land himself.

Now, that is a pretty sound principle, but do we need to buy a lot of land. Is any situation like this one going to be permanent? Why should the saviours of civilization be relegated to the outskirts of civilization? Why should the boys who put in their time digging trenches so that you and I, we are told, might be alive, why should they now go to filling in swamps or improving cut-over lands? It would seem almost as though they were entitled to a little better treatment. Maybe they would like to live in their old homes with their friends, and it would seem as though we ought to work out a scheme which will enable these returning soldiers and sailors who want to go on the land to get as good land as there is in the United States. Way back in 1909, in his Winona speech, then President Taft said that all of the best land in the country had been given away. He was absolutely right. The question is now raised, "Why should the soldiers be called upon to pay for this land, and have they got the money to do it?" I think it was Secretary Lane, although I do not want to do him an injustice, but somebody here said that they could borrow the money from their wives' relatives. Gentlemen, what would you think if you were a soldier and had risked your all and had come back to your Government and your Government said, "God bless you, boy, here is some land, and you can borrow the money from your wife's relatives and make a living in that way."

Gentlemen, that will do more to make Bolshevism than all the anarchists, or socialists, or Victor Bergers, or William D. Haywards, or Lenines or Trotskys that the world has ever produced, and the soldier is thinking along those lines. We have got to do something for them. Reclamation is a good thing, but they put convicts to work on reclamation projects.

Mr. SMITH. Where?

Mr. MARSH. Working on the roads, in some States.

Mr. SMITH. On Federal reclamation projects?

Mr. MARSH. Not on Federal reclamation projects, but on State projects. I do not think the soldiers ought to be asked to do that. I am saying again that we have not taken definite action on this,

but I have talked with a lot of our people about it. I want to be perfectly fair with you, and they think it is vastly more important that the soldiers be given a good deal better chance than this seems to afford. I have gone into it with different people, and have heard Secretary Lane explain it at least once, and have gone over it with others. Gentlemen, why do you make them pay interest for 40 years? It is provided that they shall pay 5 per cent cash and the balance shall be paid in amortizing payments extending over a period to be fixed by the Secretary not to exceed 40 years. Paying interest for 40 years to the richest Government in the world with the most multimillionaires and with 400,000,000 acres of fertile farm lands, much of which is held out of cultivation for speculation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is that?

Mr. SMITH. There is nothing to prevent them from paying it off in one year or in two or three years if they want to do so.

Mr. MARSH. The farmers make enough to pay off this indebtedness in one or two years, or soldiers who are coming back? If the farmers were that prosperous, I would not feel justified in working for them. I will tell you that frankly.

Mr. MAYS. Would you give them these farms?

Mr. MARSH. I think I would give them the right to use these farms and let the Government pay the interest while they are using them until the Government taxes the speculative value out of this land.

Mr. MAYS. Then, you would never give them title?

Mr. MARSH. Personally, I do not believe in alienating title to land the Government now owns until you have a system of taxation which is going to prevent speculating in land; and I might cite that the National Grange advocated also such a system of taxation of land values as would stop this curse of tenant farming.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the Farmers' Union organization, as such, agree with you in your plan which opposes alienation of land and home ownership?

Mr. MARSH. Does the National Farmers' Union oppose it?

Mr. FERRIS. Does any one of these farm organizations you represent agree with you about your plan? I have talked with you before and know your views about that.

Mr. MARSH. We are not facing an ordinary issue. Personally, I do believe absolutely, and I think most of the farmers do—I am glad you raised that question—in private ownership of land. I do not believe in the nationalization of land personally.

Mr. FERRIS. You do not believe the Government should pass title at all?

Mr. MARSH. Here is the question. That position is regarding individual homes or farms, or individual lots in cities; but, gentlemen, we are not confronting a general economic or even an ethical question here. We are confronting the question of the demobilization of a large army in the light of our experience in the past.

Mr. FERRIS. You are getting clear away from the subject. A moment ago you said you were not in favor of alienation; that you would let the soldier use the land, but you were opposed to alienation of the title. In response to a question, you said you were opposed to alienation, and I thought you were, because I have talked with you before on this subject. Now, what I am trying to get at is how many of these

farmers' organizations you represent agree with you on that one proposition?

MR. MARSH. I think most of them would agree with us—frankly, not all of them, but most of them—as far as this specific situation is concerned, but not as regards individual farms.

MR. FERRIS. You think that the Farmers' Union, the State granges, the American Society of Equity, and the National Gleaner Federation would approve of your plan here, which provides that the soldier shall be loaned the land or leased the land and become a tenant rather than an owner; do you think all of them would agree with that?

MR. MARSH. I think they would for this situation. Their plank provides that tenant farming should be replaced by a more extensive system of cultivation by owners. We want owners, but just to illustrate the matter, take what has happened in connection with the Liberty bonds. Thousands of people bought Liberty bonds and made a deposit of 5 per cent or 10 per cent, and they have not made any renewals; they could not. Now, here, of course, you have got to guard the title, but it is very difficult to get around it. You know what happened with the other land grants and the story of scrip paper issued on those lands after the Civil War.

MR. FERRIS. This is not a scrip proposition, Mr. Marsh. This is not a land-grant proposition. This is a proposition of individual homes for these people or trying to provide homes for them.

MR. MARSH. I think the word "homes" is too euphemistic a title to apply to swamp lands such as described by Mr. Lane as to most of the lands that are available. We think that there is imminent danger that this land will get into the hands of speculators, because no Congress can bind a succeeding Congress. Do not forget that. We can repeal the Constitution, and we can change parties from time to time and can change legislation. This is the question confronting us: Is it fair to put the soldiers on this least desirable land where they have got to make the most tremendous effort to make a living and pay interest for a long period of time, or will you gentlemen do what you can overnight, almost literally, enact a law levying an excise tax on the privilege of holding land, so that you can get land that is nearer to railroads and more productive and more fertile, and give a better opportunity to those soldiers?

I want to say one word about Dr. Atkeson's statement here that we should have overproduction. We can not share that fear.

MR. WHITE. He withdrew that.

MR. MARSH. Did he withdraw it?

MR. WHITE. He gave just his personal opinion.

MR. MARSH. May I give not only my personal view, but the view of our organization, because we discussed cooperative marketing and things of that sort. Overproduction never exists without underconsumption somewhere, and it would do more to restore the peace of the world if the United States Congress should make an appropriation of several hundred million dollars or several billion dollars—and we can do it and still leave altogether too many multi-millionaires and near billionaires in this country, and ship food to the starving people of Europe. That would do more immediately than a league of nations, I believe personally, and I have lived over there a great deal, and would do more than a peace treaty; that is, if we should

see that these folks are fed. The proposition is that we need to raise all we can and we need to export vast amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Marsh, your time is up; in fact, I have extended it, taking into consideration the questions you have been asked. Now, I would like to ask you a question. I understand it is your position that there should be no alienation of this land.

Mr. MARSH. We feel that for this specific land, not taking up the general question, that this system would be wiser for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Government to retain title?

Mr. MARSH. For the Government to retain title.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not believe any interest should be charged the soldier?

Mr. MARSH. I think that interest should be charged the soldier, frankly, only if the soldier is able to make as good a living as the average man whose life that soldier risked his life to defend.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say a while ago that the soldier should not be charged interest for the land.

Mr. MARSH. I think it would be better not to, but if you do, then charge it on that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Your resolution——

Mr. MARSH (interposing). May I add also, that promptly the Government should levy a system of taxation upon land which will prevent speculation, and when I said they should not pay interest I meant interest on the money invested in the land and not in improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. In paragraph No. 4 of your resolutions under (c) you state:

Men not experienced in farming, but who wish to farm, should be encouraged to do so by the adoption of a system similar to that which has proven so successful in the settlement of soldiers in the Province of Ontario through the provision of training for agriculture, with adequate payment during such period.

Mr. MARSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not know that the plan we have under consideration is almost identical with the Ontario plan?

Mr. MARSH. I think in some respects it is similar, but I do not think it is entirely similar. I have no objection to treating our soldiers better than the Canadians are treating theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. The amount of aid granted in the Province of Ontario is "100 acres, of which 10 acres have been cleared, will be allowed each soldier without charge, and when necessary a loan not to exceed \$500 will be made to pay for housing, machinery, tools, and live stock. The amount loaned is payable in 20 years with 6 per cent interest."

They pay interest there.

No payment of principal or interest is required for three years. This may appear a small amount, but is not so when other aid is taken into account. The ex-soldier is paid for clearing his 10 acres and also receives the assistance of his fellow settlers.

Now, they are evidently settling upon cut-over lands.

Mr. MARSH. You have misunderstood our program, Mr. Chairman. It refers to the training given the soldiers and not to the methods of settlement on the land. We certainly did not advocate any 6 per cent interest or anything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not approve the Ontario plan in whole?

Mr. MARSH. I think we can improve on it very much with great justice to the soldier.

Mr. FERRIS. Even this bill improves on that plan, because we give them 40 years instead of 20 and charge them 4 per cent instead of 6 per cent, and we will make larger allotments of land to them.

Mr. MARSH. But why should they run in debt?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Marsh, a man starting out who has nothing either has to accept a gift or run into debt.

Mr. MARSH. May I modify that statement by saying why should he run in debt for the land?

Mr. FERRIS. Do you want the Government to buy it and give it to him outright?

Mr. MARSH. I think the Government might very properly take up these other reconstruction measures and pay the soldiers as they come out for specific work. And, gentlemen, this or any similar legislation will be largely valueless if we keep up with our frightful system of tenant farming, even with the Government the owner, and there will be just as much poverty and suffering on the part of the tenant as in the Scully estate in Illinois, unless you change the land system. That is basic.

The CHAIRMAN. In Ontario they give the soldier a patent to the land in five years, and it is withheld for 10 years under this bill.

Mr. MARSH. And he is in debt.

The CHAIRMAN. Somebody has to pay for it.

Mr. MARSH. Well, it is up to you gentlemen to decide how grateful you are to the soldiers.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Marsh, in that connection, were you present at this meeting at which this reconstruction policy and program was adopted?

Mr. MARSH. Yes; I was in and out. I was not present every minute, because I was attending to a number of other things.

Mr. VAILE. Was the benefit of the returning soldier discussed at that meeting?

Mr. MARSH. The question of demobilization—we realize that sound economic conditions in the country will mean that there is no problem of demobilization of the Army. Would Switzerland or a peasant country ever have a problem of demobilization? Not the slightest, because there the land is not held as here, where some 1,400 people own about one-tenth, my recollection is, of all the land in America.

Mr. VAILE. You regarded the problem of the returning soldier primarily from the standpoint of his usefulness in industry rather than from the view of benefit to the soldier, did you not?

Mr. MARSH. Absolutely the reverse. The soldier and every other American citizen is entitled to equal opportunity, but the soldier has made certain exceptional sacrifices and it is certainly a slim reward for that sacrifice to put him out to do the rough work—and do not forget that the British Labor Party is not standing for any scheme like this.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Marsh, I notice in paragraph 11 that your organization is unalterably opposed to the establishment of militarism in America and a system of compulsory military training, and in para-

graph 7 you advocate the repeal of the espionage law and all similar laws. I do not notice in here anything at all with regard to the sacrifices made by the soldiers, and I would like to ask if your association was not, as a matter of fact, more interested in the conscientious objectors than it was in the soldiers?

Mr. MARSH. I am perfectly willing to submit that to the soldiers.

Mr. VAILE. I would like to have you point out—

Mr. MARSH (continuing). May I add this, that these delegates at this convention understood mighty well that under this economic program of justice or program of economic justice, that you would have this whole question settled, and they were not dealing in superficialities.

Mr. VAILE. I would like to have you point out, if you can, any programme or sentence in this program which refers to the sacrifices made by the soldiers or which speaks of benefits to be conferred upon the soldiers.

Mr. MARSH. We would confer the benefits upon everybody that they are entitled to, and the greatest benefit to the soldier would be for Congress to stop the reign of privilege in America. We put in different words, but that is the program.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Marsh, how many real farmers attended this conference, and how many of them were paid representatives of some organizations similar to yourself?

Mr. MARSH. I do not know; but I am sure you are not going to question the right of the farmers to select men and pay them to attend to the farmers' business.

Mr. SNELL. That was not my question.

Mr. MARSH. Do you question the right of the packers to select counsel to come before you, the most highly paid counsel in America, and I am not that, by the way, because I am getting a salary of \$3,600 a year.

Mr. SNELL. My object was to find out how many were men similar to yourself, paid representatives, who were going around organizing societies, or how many were really farmers who owned farms.

Mr. MARSH. Now, let me go down the list. Herbert Baker, of Michigan, is a farmer.

Mr. SNELL. I mean what proportion of them.

Mr. MARSH. I am going to go into it in detail. C. H. Gustafson, the president of the Nebraska Farmers' Union, has his own farm and has had two boys in the service, and he is the head of a farmers' business concern doing about \$100,000,000 a year of cooperative business. Now, they said, I presume: "Brother Gustafson, you will do us a whole lot more good if you will come off the farm and will organize this cooperative business so we can buck the big combinations of capital." It is not a question of farming. My heavens, the Department of Agriculture tells the farmer how to raise stuff and he raises the stuff, and the more he raises the poorer he sometimes gets. It is a question of distribution.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have now taken up an hour and 26 minutes listening to this gentleman. I think it is all the time one man is entitled. I want to make this statement to go into the record.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question before the witness gets through.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me finish this statement first, please. The soldiers are waiting for us to do something for them, and we are anxious to do something for them. This committee has met here for the purpose of hearing men who would throw some light on the subject we are to discuss, and the law which we hope to enact. I can see nothing gained from such statements as have gone into this record, and can see no light thrown on this matter at all. It seems to be a statement from some who are prone to agitate. It does not make any difference what legislation is enacted here, it is not going to suit certain people. Jesus Christ, Himself, could not come here and satisfy some of them, and I take it we are to go into this matter and hear men who will throw light on it and enable us to enact legislation which will be the best we can enact, and that is all we can do.

Mr. ELSTON. Will you make a motion to that effect?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnson, of course, as long as members desire to interrogate the witness——

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). I took it for granted that they were all through.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not within the province or the jurisdiction of the chairman to prohibit them from doing so. Of course, this is always subject to a motion.

Mr. GANDY. I would like to ask the witness a question.

Mr. MARSH. May I speak on a question of personal privilege before this hearing is closed?

The CHAIRMAN. No; Mr. Gandy first desires to ask you a question.

Mr. GANDY. I want to ask you a question, Mr. Marsh. In dealing with these cut-over lands that you referred to, in your opinion would it make any difference whether the land is to be reclaimed and ready-made homes or ready-made farms made out of it before the soldier buys it?

Mr. MARSH. I think it would. Mr. Gandy, you know, as well as I do——

Mr. GANDY (interposing). Let me follow that up by saying that it is the intention of this legislation to provide two things: First, work for the soldier if he wants to work at that kind of labor, and, second, that the farms shall be ready-made and the improvements made, and that they shall not constitute a desolate waste which the Secretary describes them as being now, but shall be made into a developed, growing community with modern conveniences, before the soldier is asked to buy them.

Mr. MARSH. But you will admit that if these lands were desirable they would have been snapped up long ago. You will admit that. That is obvious on the face of it. Second, you will admit that the soldier may like something different. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on the question of personal privilege. Mr. Johnson says I have not said anything, if I understood him, that will be helpful.

If I do not suggest a better chance for the soldier, a lower rate of interest, and a better opportunity to be relieved of this enormous indebtedness of the Government, I will be willing to debate the question with Mr. Johnson before any group of soldiers in the United States, and I will send out a statement to that effect to every farm

paper in the United States or to every considerable farm paper in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions that members of the committee desire to ask?

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to ask a question: Do you believe that the Government of the United States should give this land to the soldiers?

Mr. MARSH. As to the question of whether the Government of the United States should give this land to the soldiers, I would say not the title, but the chance to use the land as long as the soldier wanted to use it. That is a very different thing.

Mr. SMITH. Would you give it to him for nothing?

Mr. MARSH. For nothing, or I would not charge him any interest until, I repeat, he has made—not as much as a Congressman—but as much as the average American citizen who has made anything like a similar sacrifice for the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Under your section 5, paragraph (c), you say:

Tenant farming should be replaced by the more responsible system of cultivation by owners.

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask Mr. Marsh a few questions. Do you remember the bill that was introduced and reported at the last Congress providing homesteads for soldiers? This bill was introduced by Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. MARSH. I read it, but do not remember the details.

Mr. RAKER. Have you read the bills introduced by the various Members of Congress and myself that are now pending before this committee?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir; I have read the bill that the Department of Labor worked on.

Mr. RAKER. I would like for you to confine your answers to what I ask you, because in that way we will save time. You do not know the purpose of those bills?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. As indicated by the bills we have before us?

Mr. MARSH. Except this one. I am speaking about this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Then you have read the Mondell bill?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir; I have read the Mondell bill.

Mr. RAKER. Are you in favor of providing homes for the returning soldiers?

Mr. MARSH. I am in favor of providing homes for the returning soldiers, but in a different method from those which have been adopted in the past in giving homesteads to other people, because that system has not worked well. I do not believe that it is the part of wisdom to duplicate that mistake.

Mr. RAKER. You are not familiar with the workings of the homestead law generally, whether to soldiers or to other individuals in the Western States, are you?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Then I would like for you to confine your answers to my questions, because there is quite a difference in the working of the homestead law now. You are in favor of the Government providing homes, or individual homes, for the returning soldier whereby he can make a living for himself and family.

Mr. MARSH. Assuming, of course, that he wants to go.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; if he is willing to go and wants a home. If he wants to make a home on a farm, irrespective of its size, so as to make a living for himself and family, you are in favor of the Government providing a method or means by which he can obtain such a home?

Mr. MARSH. And be secure in his tenure.

Mr. RAKER. Just answer my question, please.

Mr. MARSH. I am not going to answer half a question or answer a question only half way. I say I am in favor of it provided the Government adopts a method which will protect that soldier, as our program says, in the ownership of his home, provided he uses it. I know of no other title except use.

Mr. RAKER. You are in favor of the Government providing the home and that the soldier shall own his home in fee, or that he shall be vested with his title in fee?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Does it make any difference—

Mr. MARSH (interposing). Pardon me—in answer to your last question, I think that if the soldier could be absolutely protected in his tenure he should have the fee, but I question whether the fee should be given him under such a system as that proposed in this bill.

Mr. RAKER. I want to ask this witness some questions, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee.

Mr. RAKER. This man has come here to help us, and I want to find out whether he knows anything about it. Are you in favor of the soldier having his title in fee after four or five years, or leaving it rather indefinite—

Mr. MARSH (interposing). I think it would be better for the Government to hold the title to the land until the soldier has been able to pay off at least most of his indebtedness.

Mr. RAKER. Then you answer that you are in favor of the Government providing homes for the soldiers. Now, does it make any difference where they should locate; that is, in what State or in what location in a given State?

Mr. MARSH. You have raised there a question of administration. Suppose these reclamation projects—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I am not talking about reclamation projects. I have not been asking about reclamation projects, but I have asked you a plain, simple question about providing homes for these soldiers. Now, would it make any difference, in providing a home, where that home should be located, or in what State it should be located?

Mr. MARSH. On general principles; no, sir. He should have freedom of selection.

Mr. RAKER. If you could provide that kind of a home for him on a reclamation project, and he voluntarily wants it and it can be done as reasonably as at any other place, are you for providing such a home for him, or are you against it because it is a reclamation home for him, or are you against it because it is a reclamation project?

Mr. MARSH. If any soldier wants a home on a reclamation project, I think he is entitled to it.

Mr. RAKER. And it would be the same thing with reference to providing the home wherever he desires it, whether on reclaimed swamp land—

Mr. MARSH (interposing). Yes, sir; if it is equally good and affords him a fair opportunity.

Mr. RAKER. And the same thing would apply whether it was cut-over land or not?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. So that, as a matter of fact, if you could provide homes at a reasonable cost where the soldiers want them, whether they are on swamp lands, reclaimed lands, or cutover lands, you are perfectly willing for the soldiers to have such homes?

Mr. MARSH. If the soldier wants it, but I will add this: That if the soldier wants that only because he can not get anything else I think that would be a bad thing for the soldier.

Mr. RAKER. Your theory is that the Government should take a piece of privately owned land and buy it and divide it up into homes for soldiers?

Mr. MARSH. My theory is much more fundamental than that.

STATEMENT OF MR. J. N. COX, REPRESENTING THE GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cox, representing the governor of Tennessee, desires to make a brief statement.

Mr. Cox. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am here as the personal representative of the governor of Tennessee on account of the fact that he is unable to appear at this time. In Tennessee, so far as I know, we are very much in favor of this bill. Our legislature at its last session passed a bill that was suggested by Secretary Lane that will enable us to take action on this matter in that State. We are in favor of this bill, but, as was suggested the other day by a gentleman who preceded me, we would like to suggest an amendment as to the loan value of the improvements and the live stock and equipment. I believe that you provide in the bill that you will loan as much as 75 per cent on the improvements and 60 per cent on the live stock and equipment. Believing that it would be hard for the soldier to secure that amount of cash, or even to work it out, we believe that it would be better to make that loan value 90 per cent on the improvements and 80 per cent on the live stock and equipment. That would require the soldier to procure only about \$500, which a great many of them can do, and it is believed that that would be better for them and more in keeping with their desires.

Now, I know that you gentlemen are going through a siege here this morning, and I will not take up any more of your time, except to say that we are very much in accord with this work and hope that the bill will go through, and to assure you that Tennessee stands ready to do her part when the times comes.

The CHAIRMAN. Has this plan the general approval of the people of your State?

Mr. Cox. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the attitude of the soldiers toward it?

Mr. Cox. I have heard a great many of them express themselves, and they are very much in favor of it.

Mr. GANDY. Do you think that there ought to be embodied with the community idea some provision for individual locations?

Mr. Cox. I doubt it. I have heard that discussed, and I believe that this community plan is the better one, because of the fact that isolated farms without improvements around them, as these community farms would have, would not be as satisfactory to the soldiers as the community plan with the road building and things of that kind undertaken by the Government.

[Telegram.]

J. N. Cox,

Care of Cordell Hull, M. C., Washington, D. C.:

Big convention here indorse soldier settlement plan calling for passage of bill after speech by York.

A. H. ROBERTS, Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your statement.

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Springer, representing the governor of New Mexico, will now be heard.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to introduce Mr. Charles Springer, of Colfax County, N. Mex. He is the chairman of the road board of that State, and is a very active citizen of our State. He will give you his views in regard to the legislation that the Legislature of New Mexico has already enacted.

STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES SPRINGER, REPRESENTING THE GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the governor of our State wired me requesting me to appear before this committee chiefly, as I understand it, to urge the necessity of a certain amendment which has been proposed by Mr. Hernandez, or a section of a bill which has been introduced by him. The reason for that is that our legislature passed a law creating a soldiers' settlement board, giving that board certain funds to be derived from the sale and rental of lands heretofore granted to New Mexico by Congress, amounting to 300,000 acres. The act of Congress, called the enabling act of our State, provides that no lands heretofore granted by Congress or the proceeds thereof may be used for any other purposes than the purposes stated in the acts themselves granting the lands, and the purpose of this amendment is to permit the lands and the proceeds to be used for soldier-settlement projects and to pay the expenses of the soldier settlement board. Two hundred and fifty thousand acres of those lands were granted for water reservoirs for irrigation, or that is the wording of the grant.

We have sold some of those lands and the proceeds are now invested in bonds or in permanent funds, and the rentals of those lands have been accumulating heretofore in the water-reservoirs-for-irrigation fund. It has been appropriated from time to time by the legislature for various purposes, there being no apparent need of using that money by the State to build reserviors. There was another

grant of 100,000 acres of land for the improvement of the Rio Grande, and there appears to be no use for that land, or of the money for this purpose by the State, which would interfere with the use of it by the soldier settlement board. We can not proceed now with the soldier settlement board unless Congress will remove that restriction from the former act as to the use of that fund.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you say it was devoted to under the former act?

Mr. SPRINGER. It says for water reservoirs for irrigation purposes. There is nothing definite, but that is the wording of the act. We still have remaining more than ample lands for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you presented that proposition to the Interior Department, and does it meet with their approval?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; it has not been to my knowledge. I do not know that it has been presented there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it not be a good idea for you to take it up with the Interior Department, inasmuch as the Interior Department has jurisdiction over the public domain and over the disposition of public lands?

Mr. SPRINGER. If you will permit me, this is not a question of the disposition of the public domain. It is really a question of whether that sovereign State shall have the right to dispose of its own property for the best interests of its people.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand it, this is something derived from the disposition of lands that were given to the State by the Federal Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Government gives land to a State, whether for a State university, a normal school, or any other congressional purpose, or for an Indian school, as they did in Colorado, when you seek to divert that money to some other purpose, you generally have to come back to the Federal Government and get their permission. If it came out of the public domain originally, the Interior Department still exercises a sort of supervisory or advisory control over the matter, and I was wondering whether, or not, the Interior Department would be in accord with your proposition to change the manner of the utilization of the proceeds arising from lands on the public domain. I think that possibly it would facilitate your proposition to have this amendment put on here if the Interior Department heartily approved it and recommended it. There would be some question raised, probably, when it came up on the floor of the House, and I think you would expedite the matter a good deal by having it submitted to the Interior Department. Mr. Hernandez, of course, realizes fully the practice of the committee of referring important matters back to the departments that they originally came from.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In further answer to that, I will say that we did not have any doubt and the legislature did not have any doubt but what these funds could be used in connection with these projects, because they are germane to this legislation. The land board, or the soldier settlement board, asked the attorney general of the State for an opinion on the subject, and he suggested that we should ask that this amendment be made before we used this fund for this purpose, so there would be no doubt about it. These are State lands that we are talking about, and they have already been granted to the State.

Mr. TAYLOR. But they were granted to the State for some special purpose.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Yes. That restriction or safeguard was thrown around the legislature at the time the grant was made. These are State lands that we want to use in order to carry out the purposes of our soldier settlement law.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no question but what it is a good purpose, and I was making a suggestion here that would help you in bringing it about, because, otherwise, somebody on the floor of the House would ask what you were trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You might get the approval of the Secretary for the proposed amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. These settlement projects in New Mexico, or most of them, will have to go on reclamation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that we will probably have no difficulty with the department in that matter.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then, there was another matter that the governor wanted me to bring before the committee, and that was the question of giving the State board some further duty in the way of co-operation than has been proposed in the present bill—either in the Mondell bill, the Ferris bill, or the Hernandez bill. I mean by that as to the actual management of the projects during the period of settlement. This provides for some cooperation or some authority on the part of the State board under certain circumstances after the settlement, as I understand, and in the fixing of the price.

The CHAIRMAN. After the payment of 25 per cent—

Mr. SPRINGER (interposing). Did not one of the bills introduced at the last session provide that if the State should furnish the land or the title to the land that it or its board might have the management and settlement of the project?

The CHAIRMAN. There may have been such a bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Are the people of Colorado pretty conversant with the terms of this so-called soldiers' settlement plan?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. It has been played up in the papers a good deal?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir; to some extent.

Mr. FERRIS. As you understand it, is the proposition pretty universally favored in New Mexico?

Mr. SPRINGER. They are in favor of the general principle, but the people there are rather in favor of the State having a little bit more to do with the management of it.

Mr. FERRIS. You mean with the administration of it?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it their opinion that this plan will render great relief or help to the soldiers?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you know of any organizations or societies of farmers and laborers, or of any sort of organizations in the State, that are actively against this plan?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir. There is only this one thing, and that is the question of whether the community plan, as suggested and as it has been discussed, will be successful. That is not in the way of disapproval, but they simply wonder whether a number of soldiers

going out upon a reclamation project, we will say, such as it would have to be in New Mexico, without any experienced farmers among them, and without any older men, and without the usual speculator, or without the usual capitalist who is interested in boosting the community, would be successful. They wonder how it will turn out; that is all. They are in favor of the general plan.

Mr. FERRIS. Do they think that Federal supervision of it will not be sufficient?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not altogether that, but they think it is an unnatural way to promote a community.

Mr. FERRIS. In the arid regions where you would have to impound water and have irrigation it would have to be in a measure that way.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir; as to the management of it, but not as to the people who would come in there and settle. This seems to be confined to soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. You would not advocate throwing this open to everybody?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would certainly advocate that a portion of every one of these projects should be devoted to other settlers or that the land should be sold to others than soldiers, so that it would not be entirely a community of soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you think the Government, with the great load the Treasury is carrying on account of the conduct of the war, should at this time tackle the job of offering this relief not only to soldiers but to anybody else who wanted it?

Mr. SPRINGER. It would not be a relief for them, but they would pay what it was worth.

Mr. FERRIS. Not now, but 40 years from now.

Mr. SPRINGER. It might be sold on a different basis to those who might be able to go in there and who might want to go in there and purchase farms.

Mr. FERRIS. Your thought would be, then, that if you interspersed and intermingled practical farmers with the soldiers it might be a good plan?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Without offering to nonsettlers the same relief, of course?

Mr. SPRINGER. It would be giving no benefit to the nonsoldier. He would provide his own money and bring in his experience to help the community.

Mr. FERRIS. I thought you intimated that you would give the same relief to the nonsoldier that you would give to the soldier, and if you did that the soldier phase of it might as well be eliminated altogether.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it would be in the interest of the soldier.

Mr. NICHOLS. Outside of possibly extending an opportunity for employment to some soldiers, do you think that this provides a great measure of relief to the soldier?

Mr. SPRINGER. It would be a very fine thing for the soldiers if you could induce them to go on farms. In that way many of them would go on farms who would not do so otherwise.

Mr. NICHOLS. What measure of relief would it afford the soldier?

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, as I understand it, a considerable portion of the capital necessary for him to establish himself upon a farm is furnished him.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know how much it will be necessary for him to furnish himself under this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. A small amount.

Mr. NICHOLS. How much would the initial payment amount to?

Mr. SPRINGER. That would depend altogether on the circumstances, the locality, and the price of the land.

Mr. FERRIS. It is 5 per cent, is it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. I understood you to ask him what was the total amount of money.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that it would be a good principle for the Government to extend this relief to anybody, regardless of whether he served in the Army or not?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; I do not think the Government should do that at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then what do you mean by saying that you would open it to all of the people?

Mr. SPRINGER. A certain portion of the land might be sold at what it is worth to outsiders, so that the community, instead of being composed of one class of persons, might be a more or less mixed community and have in it a number of good, experienced farmers, cattlemen, etc.

Mr. NICHOLS. How long do you think it would take a soldier without money to accumulate enough money to make the initial payment?

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand that he would be accumulating that money during the time of the improvement of the land—that is, he would be given a job.

Mr. NICHOLS. He would be given employment to begin with, but he could not acquire the land until he had made the initial payment. Now, how long do you think it would be necessary for the soldier to toil on the land before he would acquire enough money to make the initial payment?

Mr. SPRINGER. During the time of the development of the project. That ought to be sufficient time if the project requires five years for the development. He could save a portion of his wages during that time and have it set aside for the purpose of making the initial payment.

Mr. FERRIS. What do you think of these several plans that are being talked of here of allowing the soldier to select his farm wherever he desires to select it and make him a loan to buy it? Do you think that is a good plan?

Mr. SPRINGER. That would require a great deal of money if he selected land where the price was two or three hundred dollars per acre.

Mr. FERRIS. If you had a minimum price that should be paid for it, it would be subject to the same criticism that this would be.

Mr. SMITH. If he is without any capital to go on except what the Government lends him, it is likely that he would be able to pay interest on the purchase price and make a success on his venture.

Mr. SPRINGER. If he is a good farmer, he can pay for it.

Mr. SMITH. But it would not afford him the same opportunity if he went on a project that was worth twice as much as it cost per acre?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. How many soldiers did New Mexico send to the war, under the draft and otherwise?

Mr. SPRINGER. Between fourteen and fifteen thousand.

Mr. FERRIS. What percentage of them have been demobilized?

Mr. SPRINGER. I should say that perhaps 1,500 of them are yet in the Army.

Mr. FERRIS. So that the great bulk of them have been demobilized?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. What percentage of them, in your opinion, would avail themselves of some plan like this?

Mr. SPRINGER. Possibly one-third of them.

Mr. FERRIS. You think that one-third of them would avail themselves of a plan like this?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Is that based upon your knowledge of any concerted action of the soldiers, or upon resolutions adopted by them?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is just my opinion after talking with them.

Mr. FERRIS. From your knowledge of the conditions in your State, it is your opinion that as many as one-third of the returning soldiers would avail themselves of an opportunity like this?

Mr. SPRINGER. New projects would have to be turned out and advertised, and they would have to be worked up. Of course, they would not rush in voluntarily to do this without some propaganda, but I think that with propaganda a large number of young men would engage in this work.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there a scarcity of labor in New Mexico?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And wages are very high?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. That would, of course, make these individual farms less attractive to these people.

Mr. SPRINGER. Many a man would go into this plan who would not want to hire out as a laborer.

Mr. FERRIS. Even with high wages, the eight-hour day, and the clamor for labor, such is the desire to own homes that in the State of New Mexico you think that one-third of the soldiers would want to avail themselves of this plan?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not saying that one-third of the total, but I say that one-third of those who have come home would want this. You see, a great many have been discharged and have found other places.

I do not think a great many of our men are going to go into one of these plans.

Mr. FERRIS. What percentage would you say, when the demobilization is all completed, which is going to be very soon—I have seen a great many soldiers coming from our ships the last two or three days, coming into our ports, and they all ought to be back in a little while—what would be your statement of the percentage of 14,000 or 15,000 soldiers returning, from New Mexico, who would desire to avail themselves of the project?

Mr. SPRINGER. Probably 8 or 10 per cent.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask you this: Are many of the soldiers that have come back to New Mexico having trouble to find employment, or are they falling into their old positions?

Mr. SPRINGER. We have placed some 45 men in the Council of National Defense as a part of our duties. It has been almost altogether men from outside of the State.

Mr. FERRIS. You have placed men outside?

Mr. SPRINGER. Soldiers coming from other States than New Mexico. I do not suppose we had a dozen from our own men.

Mr. FERRIS. They have all dropped back into their own work. Of course, after the Spanish-American War men did stalk the roads for several years after that, as members of this committee remember I lived on a farm in Missouri at that time. My father had several farms. The street was lined with bleached and faded soldiers who couldn't get anything to do. Mother tried to feed them, but father couldn't hire them all. And they walked the streets in hunger without positions.

Of course, that condition does not prevail now and probably will not prevail. With the high wages and short hours and labor pretty plentiful, the number that will avail themselves of these farm lands will be less in percentage than if it were otherwise. Isn't that true?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Springer, do you believe this bill is sufficiently liberal in the aid it extends to soldiers? Do you believe it ought to be adopted as it is or amended to make it more liberal in opportunities to the returning soldiers in the matter of the aid it extends?

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe the soldier will be better off if he is not helped too much; if he is going to succeed on the farm he should be able to pay for aid.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is quite true. Do you favor the provisions of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think this bill should be adopted? Is it sufficiently liberal?

Mr. SPRINGER. As to aid extended to soldiers?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Springer, I would like to ask you if in a case of this kind where the young man has returned from the service, say, the son of a farmer, in a regiment in your own State, and he has means, possibly enough to pay on 25 per cent of the land; he is familiar with the conditions that exist in his locality; he was born there, raised there, and he has the ambition but not the means to go into business. His father, for a number of different reasons not necessary to state any one of them, is unable to stake him. In case he could pay 25 per cent on that land, or 40 per cent on it, a larger amount than the Government requires and yet could not go into business for himself; don't you believe, Mr. Springer, that the Government would be equally as well safeguarded if he should be allowed to purchase a segregated farm with which he is familiar, knowing its production qualities and the possibilities of its being a revenue-producing project, with the ambition and vim that is always necessary to bring success, don't you believe the Government would be as well safe-guarded in a case of that kind as in anyone of these projects?

Mr. SPRINGER. Possibly better safeguarded.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to put that question to you.

Mr. SPRINGER. Possibly better safeguarded.

Mr. WHITE. I will ask another question. Don't you believe, too, that this young man with the prudent view of things that he has gotten in the two years of Army experience would be as likely to succeed, possibly more so, than if he would take it up with a project where he is not familiar with conditions?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do, but he would have to pay the market price for his land, whereas in the project he might get it at a price which would double or treble in a few years.

Mr. WHITE. With the counsel of his friends he would be better acquainted with the market price of lands and would not be as likely to be taken advantage of?

Mr. SPRINGER. Perhaps.

The CHAIRMAN. Director Davis is here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, Congressman McDuffie, of Alabama, has phoned and asked to be allowed to submit a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I told him the committee would soon conclude and for him to come right up.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. W. SUMMERS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Chairman, the delegation from the State of Washington ask me to make a very brief statement. One-third of the State of Washington lies within the public domain. The legislature in March, 1919, passed legislation for the organization of the State reclamation board. They also enacted legislation which will provide \$500,000 annually for the next ten years to be expended for purposes of reclamation. They have made an outright appropriation of \$100,000 for an investigation looking to the reclamation of a certain area within that State, and an appropriation of \$10,000 to cooperate with the Federal Government in the investigation of another project. All of this vast sum that has been provided by the State of Washington was to allow the fullest cooperation with the Federal Government.

Our reclaimed lands are producing annually from \$30 to \$1,500 per acre. Speaking specifically, I will say that we have lying within one county 200,000 acres of reclaimed lands, which averaged last year \$150 per acre, and that we have another area of reclaimed lands which averaged \$280 per acre, and that we have several other similar reclaimed areas equally productive within the State of Washington. We have also several million acres of unreclaimed lands lying within the State, equally fertile. I bring this to the attention of the committee because it has been so repeatedly stated here by gentlemen who are not familiar with these lands that we are trying to give the soldiers land that nobody else wants. I maintain that as far as our part of the country is concerned we are offering the cream of the land, and an opportunity whereby we believe the energetic soldier can provide a

home for himself and his family. I have before me a wire from the Washington State Reclamation Board, in which they say:

We have examined House bill 487, entitled "National soldiers' settlement act," and wish to urge upon you the necessity for pushing passage of this measure or similar legislation. We are ready for complete and extensive cooperation.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In your opening statement did you state that one-third of the public lands lie in the State of Washington?

Mr. SUMMERS. No; one-third of the State of Washington lies within the public domain.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear now from Mr. McDuffie.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN McDUFFIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM ALABAMA.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Gentlemen, I have the opportunity of making a few general observations before this committee. I have come here on several occasions just to get an idea what you propose to do, and I have been convinced, if you please, with the earnestness with which you gentlemen are trying to work out this proposition, and it is a big proposition. Your first thought, regardless of this suggestion by certain individuals that it is a proposition on foot to reclaim certain particular sections of this country, your first object, I take it and I know it is, is to try to get Congress to show its appreciation of the service of our soldiers. I put no credence in and have no patience with the man who is trying to be a stumbling block in the way of this legislation by saying it is a particular scheme for some particular locality. I know you are not thinking even of that. You are all trying to do something for the returning soldiers.

The question before you is what is the most feasible plan. I want to go on record, and while I could not bind the Alabama delegation in my remarks I can go so far as to say the whole delegation is in favor of legislation of this character to aid the returning soldiers.

Now, this is a great piece of legislation. The question of getting the man on the farm or getting him into some work where he can be satisfied and where his mind will not become a field for the sowing of the seeds of propaganda that would be inimical to the best interests of this Government, it is a good solution for that, in my judgment.

The average soldier coming back feels that the Government owes him something. The Government does owe him something. There is no question about it. In order to settle him on a farm I do not mean to put him at digging stumps or clearing land; that is not the proposition. This Government can do it and it is big enough to do it. If we can create these community settlements where it will be attractive, so he can take his wife there and start a home, it will be a great thing for the Government, and not only for the soldier but for the Government. I want to go on record as heartily in favor of this legislation.

Now, the question that has been troubling me as I heard this discussion here before this committee is what will we do with the man who does not care to farm. My objection to the bill is it is not big enough. I think you are mistaken about 3 per cent of the soldiers taking advantage of this legislation. I think there will be 25 per

cent in the end, probably more, and I think the bill does not carry appropriation enough and is not big enough to take care of the demands that will be made under this legislation. That is my humble judgment about this bill. The Government is big enough to do big things and if this Government can create these localities, no matter where, East or West or South or North, or wherever they may be, why you are doing something that really is necessary at this stage of our Government. There is more or less unrest in this Government at this day and time, and the congested centers need to be relieved, and if you can get these men out and get them happily situated on these lands then you are making splendid citizens of them, because if you go into the rural parts of this country you will find on an average splendid Americanism. It is no place for Bolshevism; it is no place for the seeds of propaganda that would tend to destroy the principles of this Government. In the rural parts you will find genuine Americanism and the more people we can put on a project of this kind the better off this Government will be in the future.

Now, as I said, the question is what will we do to show an appreciation for the man who is not ready to go on the farm: does not care to farm? What provision will we make, if any? It may be that this is simply a beginning, a step in the right direction, and that we do not expect all of those who wish the opportunity to take advantage of it in the beginning. As I understand, this legislation is but the start, if you please, of Congress to do something for the returning soldier, and you don't expect it to take care of all those who we wish to take advantage of it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. McDuffie, in your opinion, would it be feasible to make this proposition to 4,000,000 soldiers? The Federal Government will approve the purchase price and approve and appraise and buy or loan to each individual soldier a sum ranging, say, from \$1,000 to \$2,500, as a part payment on either a farm or a house and lot any time that he would select this. Then let him work out his own salvation for the balance.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That would be a good idea, provided we can safeguard the handling of the \$1,000 to \$2,500.

Mr. FERRIS. With legislation to restrict its alienation and compel him to keep it. Would that be attractive to a soldier and enable him to get a start for a home?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I should think so. I don't think it is well to just turn over a certain amount of money to every soldier who took part in this war, because I think in a day, a week, or a month a few might have it all.

Mr. FERRIS. It might be a Saturday night joy ride?

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is the idea.

Mr. FERRIS. But if you proposed to 4,000,000 soldiers that the American Government, as an appreciation of your service, will loan you a sum not exceeding \$2,500 to pay in toto or in part payment for a home on a spot that you can call your home, where would we land up with that kind of a proposition?

Mr. McDUFFIE. And not say that they must go to farming?

Mr. FERRIS. Let it be a home in town or out of town, wherever he wants to select it, subject to the approval of some Federal board that would see he didn't pay more than it was worth and see that he got value for the money.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I don't know but that would be a feasible plan. I do not think that would have a tendency to drive them back in the congested cities, because they would not get a home there to start with on that much money. They would necessarily go to the more sparsely settled parts of the Union.

Mr. FERRIS. At the most, if everybody took a \$2,500 loan from the Government for the purchase of a home, it would take \$10,000,000,000. If every soldier got a long-tenure loan at a low rate of interest to apply on the purchase of the home, that might in the last analysis cost the Government \$10,000,000,000; but, again, there ought to be restrictions thrown about that so that if a man owned his own home he could not avail himself of it. That would reduce the amount.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. So far as this goes, you think this is a step in the right direction?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Absolutely.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we ought to urge this legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Unquestionably. You are not going to get any sort of bill that will please everybody. If you will satisfy the soldier, and that is the main purpose of our legislation, that you are trying to show appreciation for his services, then you have done a good work. There is no question about that. The fellow that is disgruntled, if he is not a soldier, you need not worry about him. Some people will say we ought to have a settlement in our community. We ought to have these cut-over lands, or arid lands, or drainage done, wherever it may be, but if you can so provide in this legislation as to satisfy the soldier, you will have accomplished your purpose regardless of the criticisms that may be made.

My State legislature will meet in extraordinary session in July and they are going to make some provision to cooperate with the Government in this legislation. I do not know, I could not even give you the outline of it just now, but if the Government sees fit to use any part of that, then the State is ready to cooperate.

Mr. FERRIS. What would you say to a proviso incorporated in this bill that if such States as do not have available projects and such States as do not have land available for this purpose, then and in that event we might revert to a plan similar to the one I have just suggested.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is your idea to see that some soldiers settle in every State in the Union?

Mr. FERRIS. I have that in mind, yes; because, if I may digress enough, there is some particularly serious objection to the purpose of forcing a man in Alabama, for instance, to go to Wyoming, or a man in Wyoming to go to Alabama. I do not mean any disrespect to either State, but a man who loves Alabama would rather settle in Alabama than in Utah or Wyoming. I am thinking along that line.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think that is a good thought and will likely meet with the approval of every one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some States, like Iowa and Kansas, where there would not be any projects of this kind, do not relish the idea of having their boys forced to go to some other State, and Mr. Ferris's idea is possibly there might be some amendment here that would

satisfy the objections of some of these States to this bill on that particular ground.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was trying to get your idea as to whether or not something of that sort could be worked out and be feasible.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I do not see why it should not be, provided we can get enough money appropriated.

Mr. FERRIS. If they took the maximum and everyone were a homeless soldier and everyone availed himself of it, the gross sum used for the purpose would be \$10,000,000,000, and we have loaned to our allies and friends in this war \$11,000,000,000. Might that, covering a period of years, not be too great a sum? It would not all have to be spent to-morrow.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is my judgment. I think we may as well begin with that in view, with the idea of expanding the proposition to that extent. I think that would be the best feasible plan.

Mr. GANDY. After securing this home he would still have a job out of which he could make a living?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes, sir; that is it.

Mr. GANDY. What could we do toward securing him a job and giving him a position for his time? Don't you think we are going far to undertake to buy a residence or a bungalow for all the soldiers in a city or town?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think you would be going too far, if there were no restrictions, to say, "Here is a home in this city or town or wherever you want it." But I understand there would be certain restrictions with this proposition of loaning him the money, provided he wishes to take advantage of it in his home town or wherever he can make the best bargain. You have done your part. If he is not able to meet his payments and can not get it done, then he has fallen down and has not measured up. They do not want you to be giving them something. It is simply a question of giving them opportunity. You have made good your obligations to the soldier and if he can not live up to his, certainly you are not to blame.

Mr. FERRIS. We could reach a beneficial result to the soldier by giving him a long tenure loan at a low rate of interest and exempt the property while it was under this legislation; class it as Government property.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes, sir; I am in favor of that same plan.

Mr. FERRIS. We did that with the farmers on the farms. We exempted them from taxes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I feel I can safely say for myself and the rest of our delegation that we are heartily in favor of some legislation. I take it that everybody wants to do something. The big question is, what is feasible for us to do?

Mr. TAYLOR. You feel, and your delegation is broad enough to favor some legislation, although it does not like every part of the bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think the people of Alabama feel that way about it. I believe while they may not approve of every line of the bill, the general tenor of the bill would be satisfactory to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. This legislation is not a matter of perfection, but we have got to do the best we can.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not believe this will inure solely to the benefit of the West?

Mr. McDUFFIE. No, sir; Mr. Chairman, I am one of those newly elected, bewildered fellows up here, and I am not taking myself so seriously as to think I can make suggestions or reform anybody, but I regret to say that the day has not yet come when we can get along without some fellow jumping up to say something about some particular section of this country. I heard a gentleman in here the other day say something repeatedly about my own part of the country. I am going to hurrah for my own country. I am for the whole country, too; I am for my own country, but we ought to be big Americans. We ought not to allow little things like that to enter into our minds. We ought to deal with this on a big scale as big Americans.

I do not think it is for the benefit of any particular locality or section. I think it is intended, and I know this committee wants, to do something for the soldiers, regardless of where the land is. The idea of the soldier who lived in Alabama is that he would rather be among his own people if it is possible for you to give him the opportunity there, and I hope some plan can be arrived at by the committee and by the House that will permit us to give the soldier an opportunity at his own home. I think that is a good suggestion, because they do not want to leave home if they can help it. Some of them would do it, and I believe you will find that my prediction is right, that more than 3 per cent of the soldiers, and much more than that, will seek advantage of this legislation.

Mr. BAER. That is, no soldiers would seek advantage of the farms unless they could really own those farms—become home owners. They would have to have the right of tenure.

Mr. McDUFFIE. How is that?

Mr. BAER. The soldiers that seek them will want to own them.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I do not like the idea of the Government taking hold and saying we must do this and that, and I do not want us to approve any measure along that line. I think it leads to too much control.

Mr. BAER. Do you know that one-third of the people live in the country and two-thirds live in the city?

Mr. McDUFFIE. I didn't know it was quite so great.

Mr. BAER. Consequently, every time you make a farm you are making opportunities for people to become machinists and barbers and butchers in the near-by city; every time you do that you are building up an opportunity for two people to live in the city or town. Don't you think that part will take care of your proposition to give an opportunity to all the soldiers?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Probably so, and I want to ask for information here, if you please, whether or not you propose to make any provision in this bill or any changes to affect the soldiers of the Spanish-American War. Do you propose to include them in this legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter before the committee which was advocated by some of the witnesses.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I would like to see it done if it is at all possible. I think it would be very wise legislation. Of course, that war was not as big a war and not so much involved. I think it would be well to give them consideration, if possible. I will leave it to this committee to give them all that is fair, for I know you men are really trying to do your full duty.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate your coming before the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Before you call the next witness, is it the purpose for Mr. Davis to go on and complete his statement?

The CHAIRMAN. I was in hopes he would complete it to-day.

Mr. GANDY. I suggest that Director Davis ought to have a fresher audience and it is not doing him justice to ask him to address us now.

The CHAIRMAN. It is evidently the wish of the committee to hear Mr. Davis to-morrow, at 10 o'clock.

Mr. SUMMERS. I move that with the testimony of Director Davis the hearings close.

Mr. RAKER. Let us not take action on that to-day. There are some other members that are figuring on being here, and we will hear from Mr. Davis. Let us hear from Mr. Davis first.

Mr. FERRIS. Might we have an executive session for a moment or two?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BAER. Here is a soldier boy just come from overseas and he says they are all enthusiastically in favor of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order and go into executive session.

(Thereupon, at 12.30 o'clock p. m., the committee went into executive session, after which an adjournment was taken until 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, June 11, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 11, 1919.

The committee met at 10.15 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnett (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. We have Director Davis before us this morning, gentlemen, whose testimony was interrupted last week. Mr. Davis, will you resume?

I might say, Mr. Davis, that Mr. Atkeson in his criticisms upon the Reclamation Service referred to certain data in the June Reclamation Record of 1919, and criticized the showing set forth on page 276 concerning the King Hill project in Idaho; also the Lower Yellowstone project, Montana-North Dakota, referred to on page 278 of the June Reclamation Record; and also the report upon the Lower Yellowstone project, Montana-North Dakota, referred to on page 279 of the June Reclamation Record. You have seen the testimony of Mr. Atkeson, and I would like to get your views upon those reports that Mr. Atkeson referred to.

**STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR P. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE
RECLAMATION SERVICE.**

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have the abstract of Mr. Atkeson's testimony before me, and I find that he was somewhat confused—no doubt honestly so—as to the meaning of the figures he quoted, which is an illustration of the danger of being misled by a half truth.

It is true that on page 276 of the June Reclamation Record the statement is made that the wheat upon the King Hill project yielded an average of 4 bushels per acre. There were only 125 acres of that altogether. Evidently that was a crop failure. If he had read the footnote of the same table that is printed, just under the table, he would have read this:

Low yield due to irregular flow caused by breaks in canal. This project was built under private auspices and the Government is undertaking its reconstruction. Operation and maintenance are handled by the settlers through an irrigation district.

The CHAIRMAN. And his testimony was inclined to give the committee an erroneous idea—I suppose inadvertently—by not reading that explanation.

Mr. DAVIS. The fact is that like other human venture the attempt to irrigate arid lands does not always succeed. In the case of King Hill, in Idaho, very great difficulties existed, and not sufficient effort or capital was available to carry the project out successfully by private enterprise, and the project failed financially.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not a Government project at all?

Mr. DAVIS. It was a private project, a private enterprise, and after some time its works were sold at sheriff's sale and were bought by the State. Then the State asked the United States to take it up and gave the United States clear title for nothing, and the United States is now undertaking the construction work there. Not only is the construction work incomplete and never has been completed, but part of that which was completed was very insecurely built, and it happened last summer, while the reconstruction of a portion of it was under way, a portion of the old part broke and interrupted the water supply at such a time as to cause a failure of the wheat crop, and of course 4 bushels to the acre is a crop failure, and Mr. Atkeson is perfectly correct in saying that the income from that would not pay for the water, but that is not any fair illustration of what irrigation can do.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you take over that project and start to reconstruct it?

Mr. DAVIS. The authority to take it over was given by Congress last year, and we began the reconstruction last year.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask you, was not the failure there, Mr. Director, due to engineering mistakes and also to the failure of the corporations furnishing the money to have money available just at the time it was necessary?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. The United States has never operated and does not now operate that project; it has no contract for operating it. In fact, it is specifically relieved from any such possibility. The reconstruction is all that we are undertaking, and that is now under way. We were greatly hampered last year by lack of labor during the time the War was in progress and shipbuilding was going on at a great rate, but that difficulty is now passed.

The CHAIRMAN. But even with that irregular flow and the breakdown in the canal they raised alfalfa per acre amounting to \$32.94, as shown at the head of the itemized statement.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. In regard to the statement concerning the Lower Yellowstone, Mr. Atkeson was evidently confused, for he says:

In the Yellowstone project in Montana and North Dakota—it is in both States—in 1918 the wheat yield of this project was 15 bushels an acre, which is the average for the country, but the total acreage, which includes the production of alfalfa at \$33 an acre and alfalfa seed at \$66 an acre, the total production of those acres in that project was \$31.85. The crop on the Yellowstone project in Montana and North Dakota—that seems to be the same project—was \$11.39. That seems to be the same thing.

It would naturally occur to one to investigate the cause of the difference between \$31.85 and \$11.39, and if he had looked he would have seen that one headed "Irrigated land," and the other was headed "Nonirrigated land," and that accounts for the discrepancy.

Mr. SNELL. It was \$33 an acre where it was irrigated and \$11 where it was not irrigated?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; \$33 where it was irrigated and \$11.39 where it was not irrigated.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not call to the attention of the committee the fact that the \$11.39 was on the nonirrigated lands?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. SNELL. How much does the water cost; do you remember, offhand?

Mr. DAVIS. The annual charge for water on the Lower Yellowstone project is 75 cents per acre-foot.

Mr. SNELL. What does "per acre-foot" mean

Mr. DAVIS. An acre-foot is a unit of water, just like a quart or a gallon would be sufficient to cover 1 acre 1 foot deep, or 43,560 water that would be sufficient to cover 1 acre 1 foot deep, or 43,560 cubic feet of water. That is an acre-foot, and 75 cents is charged for that, and 2 feet to the acre would cost \$1.50.

Mr. SNELL. What is the average amount used on an acre on that project?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume about 2 acre-feet, or a little less than 2 acre-feet, probably.

To illustrate the difference we have statistics of the yield during the year of 1918 for the entire country, the average yield of all the crop. The gross is \$32.92. That includes the entire United States.

The CHAIRMAN. For what year?

Mr. DAVIS. For the year 1918. On the reclamation projects, taking good, bad, and indifferent, all of them, the average is \$63.95 per acre, almost exactly double what the yield of nonirrigated land is, taking the country over.

Mr. HERSMAN. Does that include orchards?

Mr. DAVIS. It includes orchards, but there is but little orchard work done on the reclamation projects.

Mr. HERSMAN. \$32 includes the orchard work?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. And the orchard returns?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; as a matter of fact, agriculture in the country at large is so much older than that on the reclamation projects, built by the Government, that the percentage of orchards is probably greater in returns, and there are only two of our projects that have any considerable acreage in yielding orchards, Yakima and Salt River.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard the testimony of Mr. Atkeson about abandoned projects, irrigation projects, in Colorado. Are there any abandoned Government reclamation projects in Colorado?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; we have two projects in Colorado, both of which are prosperous and operating.

Another statement that Mr. Atkeson made, was undoubtedly made honestly, but I think it is open to question. That is the statement that Mr. F. H. Newell, former director of the Reclamation Service, whose experience in settlement work and in colonization in the West would, of course, carry great weight—he claimed that Mr. Newell was opposed to this bill, as I understood it, or at least to the plan—and he submitted, in support of that statement, an article written for the Vocational Summary, by Prof. Newell, headed: "What are we to do with the returning soldiers and sailors? Shall we send them back on the unutilized farms, as many persons advocate?" The article covers a page, and is mainly a series of questions without answers, which throw some doubt upon the wisdom of the project, undoubtedly. The strongest statement that he does make is that with which he closes. He says this:

Until it can be demonstrated that farming is, in the long run, as profitable to the farmer as it is to the community, or yields returns comparable to those obtained from mechanical trades, it is unwise to urge the returning soldier or sailor to assume the new duty and responsibility.

Now, if this bill is a bill to urge soldiers and sailors to go onto the farms, and if it is true that farming is less profitable than mechanical trades, then that statement of Mr. Newell's might be construed to mean opposition to the bill. But I have a letter from Mr. Newell, at a later date, beginning as follows:

Herewith is a copy of a letter I am sending to Secretary Lane. While I was disappointed that the soldiers' settlement bill did not pass, I was not at all surprised, as my acquaintances outside of the Reclamation Service were very positive at all times that this scheme would not go through.

That is the first paragraph of his letter to me. It inclosed a copy of a letter to Secretary Lane, which began as follows:

DEAR MR. LANE: The failure of Congress to act on the soldier settlement bill has been very generally commented upon, and it is needless for me to express to you my regret that your efforts have not been thus far more successful.

Those letters are very much more to the point and direct regarding the plan of Secretary Lane. The article is of a general nature, and deals not only with the suggestions made by Secretary Lane, but with others, and is not positive in opposing this particular legislation or this particular plan.

There have been before the committee four different witnesses—and I do not know but more, but four that I remember—who have opposed giving title to the soldier when this scheme goes through. Now, that, I think, in the minds of all those gentlemen whom I heard, is founded upon a theory that the benefits of the increase of land values caused by the presence of population and the demand for land, and not caused by the efforts of the owner, should go to the community which creates those values and not to the owner; and if those people who hold those views applied them generally there might be some argument about it, but that is a totally different thing from withholding title. It is not necessary to secure that to withhold title, nor is it promotive of that idea to withhold title.

In connection with this matter we have been urged to allow each soldier to select his own farm and go onto that farm, and the Govern-

ment finance him thereon, loaning him 100 per cent of the value thereof. I mention that now because those two propositions are very closely interlaced. We have a variety of reasons for determining, deciding upon a colony proposition. This matter was discussed before the Committee on Appropriations last spring, and the fact was brought out, as we have known for a long time, that it is not by any means a new proposition. The philosophy of placing settlers all over the country wherever the individual desires to go, is an old one. It has been tried in Europe; it has been tried in Australia; it has been tried by private enterprise in this country to a certain extent—never to 100 per cent—but so far as that proposition has ever been tried by a Government, so far as my information goes, it has always failed.

Let me read what is said by an experienced man on that subject. You have heard in these hearings of Dr. Elwood Mead, who for several years was in charge of rural settlement in Australia, and in preparation for that work he and the commission of which he was a member made an extensive tour in Europe to examine the rural settlements in Europe. He examined them in Germany, in Italy, in Denmark, and in Ireland, and in every place where they could find them, and they examined carefully into their different experiments, the laws and rules under which they operated, the method of doing anything, and the success or nonsuccess which had attended their efforts; and in the document which I hold in my hand, which is "Hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriation in charge of the Sundry Civil Appropriation bill for 1920, Sixty-fifth Congress, Third Session." Dr. Mead gave a brief account of his experience to the committee, and this question was put to him: Whether or not it would be better to settle the soldiers wherever they desired to be settled, or to scatter them among existing settlement. He replied as follows:

When we began to provide opportunities for settlers in Australia, this argument was used: "Help individuals buy farms wherever they want to live." We started doing that.

Two or three people would buy a farm formerly owned by one person. That plan was a complete failure and the trouble was this: The farm buyer had to pay for the farm in addition to making the living. Around him were people owning farms and living in a generous way. The man who had a farm to pay for would have to work harder, wear poorer clothes, and be more economic than his neighbors, and he wouldn't do it. We found that a large percentage of these isolated settlers were not meeting their payments; and if we sent a man to see them, we would have to pay his railroad fare to and fro, as well as his salary, and oftentimes when he got there he couldn't do anything; and if the farm was surrendered, it was hard to sell it. To make a long story short, we had to abandon that plan. We had to have a certain number of people to go with the enterprise who would look after the settlement to see that the farming was done right, to help the inexperienced, and speed up the slackers. It is the conclusion of the commission that has investigated individual settlements and community settlements in England, and it is the conclusion in Australia that there must be at least 100 people in a settlement to make the thing solvent. Then the Government can afford to hire a man to look after it without the overhead becoming too burdensome.

So you see, gentlemen, the proposition to settle on individual farms scattered throughout the country, irrespective of allowing 100 per cent on those farms, is one that has been tried and has failed. When you see a man of prominence, who has a reputation to sustain and a future to look out for, stating in public like that, that he has tried something, and that he has failed, you can come pretty near believing

him. If somebody else said he failed, you might question it. But that is the fact, that it has failed there and failed in England, and they have adopted a similar limit in England. If this proposition is to be made solvent, that plan won't work.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Davis, now I appreciate that kind of testimony and give credence to it, but what have you got to say in regard to this man from the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, who says he has been doing the same thing in this country and has made a success of it—putting men on individual farms? That was his testimony here.

Mr. DAVIS. I heard his testimony; yes. I know nothing about the facts except what he stated, and you heard that.

Mr. SNELL. But his testimony is almost the opposite of this of Dr. Mead's.

Mr. ELSTON. To this extent, his testimony and that of Dr. Mead was the same to the extent that all of these men were put upon one large tract where their condition was parallel in all respects. They were not in isolated settlements. In a way, the whole thing was a virgin proposition, and everybody that started started on a par, so there wouldn't be the comparison that Prof. Mead speaks of, that destroyed the thing in Australia.

Mr. VAILE. And they started in a neighborhood where other men were starting in in the same way.

Mr. ELSTON. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS. My understanding of it was that Mr. Hunter's enterprise was taken up on large tracts of land, and that he did settle large numbers of settlers in the same vicinity. He put them on large tracts; he discouraged less than 320 acres, and as a dry-farming proposition, I think it is right. It is a dry-farming proposition and to make that a success, you must plow all the land every year and crop it only every other year. You let it lie fallow every other year—that is called "summer fallow," and to do that you have got to have a larger acreage than for intensive farming. By dry-farming methods you can't undertake intensive farming as you can under irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Would I interrupt you there—you stopped reading from that House document at a point where Mr. Mondell put this question:

Mr. MONDELL. In other words, you must do your development work with considerable areas, where you would control all of the land on which you would establish these communities?

Dr. MEAD. Yes, sir; and that makes it possible to create cooperative organizations. We couldn't have bought material to any advantage if we had bought only one farm here and there, but in buying for 100 or 150 settlers, as we have been buying in California, we are able to get wholesale rates, and even better rates than that.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; I was going to expand on that a little.

Mr. ELSTON. Please expand on the proposition of the lower cost of the land, considering the improvements as well, as to whether he gets the unearned increment, I mean, on the colony proposition, and where he does not get that if he goes into a settled community.

Mr. DAVIS. That is exactly what I was intending to do. That is why I mentioned those two things in conjunction. If we can, as I stated the other day, buy tracts of five or ten thousand acres of land, up to—

Mr. SNELL (interposing). What will be the smallest amount you think will be available?

Mr. DAVIS. That will depend upon the locality. I think a project of four or five thousand acres near a large city, that was adapted to trucking, could be made successful, but where you have to go farther away and give a larger area to the individual, it would take more land, and I think probably the minimum of 100 families is approximately correct. But I do not think that any hard and fast rule of that kind should be made, because conditions differ so. For example, in some localities they have very different county agents who might be competent in some cases to undertake the supervision of a somewhat smaller colony in conjunction with other work he does, without jeopardizing the success of the project.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Davis, it has not been determined or even demonstrated yet that 25 or 30 or 40 or 50 or 60 families would not make a success in a project, has it?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; but it is demonstrated unquestionably that a colony as small as that would have a higher overhead proportion of expense than a larger colony would, if they get the same expert service and advice. Now, those expert services and advices—those expert assistants are very important. For example, on our project and in any settlement that is undertaken nowadays, and applying also to the individual ownerships that have been discussed—take the reclamation project at present; we open enough land for, say, 100 families. Settlers go in there—they come from all parts of the country. They file and take their chances on whether they get a homestead or not. A fellow goes out and pays somebody something to show him his particular tract and he looks it over and picks out a place for his house. He never planned a house before in his life; he has to make his own plans; he has to go to some town and hire a carpenter whom he never saw before; he has to hire a painter; he has to hire a glazier; he has to hire a bricklayer to put in the foundation; he has to hire a number of people in that way, some of whom may be incompetent—probably will be. He has to haul them out to his place to do a little job of work that has to be done, and he has to send them back. He has to buy the little lumber that he wants in the local lumberyard, and probably he can't get the kind of lumber that he ought to have; probably he can't get the dimensions that he ought to have, and he has to take what he can get and pay retail prices for it and haul it out and saw it up by hand on the ground.

Mr. RAKER. Right in that connection now, supposing—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Now, gentlemen, if he is going to be interrupted, I think Mr. Benham wanted to ask a question a few minutes ago.

Mr. RAKER. I just wanted to supplement a question awhile ago, but go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. I simply didn't want Mr. Benham to lose his opportunity if Mr. Davis is going to be interrupted.

Mr. BENHAM. He had a certain question awhile ago that I was anxious to ask him about now. I can, however, hold it until he gets through.

Mr. DAVIS. The cooperative plan that we propose would do away with all that. Instead of the farmer paying twice as much as he should, wasting a lot of his own time, paying more than he should

for his house, and having as a result a poorly built house, insanitary, inconvenient, and everything wrong, the plans will all be made in advance by experts from which this farmer can select a house adapted to his taste, his financial condition, the size of the family, and the location where he expects to live. He will have a number of good plans to select from. He will have a bill of materials worked out by experts. Those materials will be ordered for hundreds or thousands of houses. They will be sawed up to dimensions at the mills, shipped in by the carload or trainload, exactly the kind and dimensions wanted. Crews of carpenters, masons, glaziers, painters, and all the expert or skilled mechanics that are required to build that house, and the architect to supervise them all and see that it is done right will be there. Those houses will be constructed on a quantity basis. When they get through with one house they will go and build another just like it.

Now, we know what a vast difference it makes whether you are building two or three automobiles by hand, or whether you turn out 1,000 a day. The difference is between detail and quantity production, not only in the construction and provision of the house itself, but in the purchase of materials, in getting the materials sawed up by machinery in the mill where it is sawed, and purchasing it by wholesale, shipping it in by wholesale, and having everything done in a wholesale way. The same kind of advice can be exercised in the selection of stock. You can afford to employ the highest experts obtainable at almost any price to select thoroughbred cattle, thoroughbred horses, thoroughbred sheep, or hogs, or chickens, or anything else that is wanted, and every colony that the United States handles would get the advantage of the expert's skill, because he could go to half a dozen different markets in the same year and supply hundreds of these colonies with the same skill. That is absolutely impossible, even for colonies under private enterprise, and how much more impossible for the individual himself? So that every one of these men, even with a small farm, a small allotment close to town that only has 1 or 2 acres, and only one cow, can have the services of a high-grade thoroughbred bull, and the same way with the pigs that he has. He don't have to own a \$10,000 sire to get the advantage of that sire. And the community that has had such advantages, being related to and under the same management as some other community when the time comes that they have to change that sire on account of the relation of its progeny, that change can be made without any cost but the freight.

Now, that is merely an illustration of a thousand other things. These men will need more or less instruction or experience, more or less practice, and I think of these as colonies where there can be a small agricultural school supervised by the highest grade experts obtainable. Those schools will largely be established and under the supervision of a high-grade expert from the agricultural college of the State, or the commissioners of agriculture of the States can be brought in, and so far a great many of them have already expressed a willingness to cooperate. We are right now arranging for co-operation with this in view with the University of Arizona, where they are proposing now to make investigations with State money that will be available if we should take up the project. They are going to investigate the matter of soldier settlements.

Now, Mr. Benham, pardon me for keeping you waiting so long.

MR. BENHAM. I can withhold my question until you get though just as well.

MR. RAKER. If Mr. Benham is going to hold his question, I want to ask this further question here. You say there would have to be settlements, you thought, of 100 families at least; from that on up, and then your illustration describes and gives the reason for it.

Would it make it any different, Mr. Davis—supposing you had one settlement at Alturas and one at Canby, 20 miles away, of 15,000 acres, and one over at Centerville, another 15 miles away of 10,000 acres, and then one down at Likely, of 30,000 acres, and then one off in the Pitt River in the other direction 20 miles away—

MR. ELSTON (interposing). You are selecting all these in your own district, Judge.

The CHAIRMAN. You might get over the line into Oregon, Judge. [Laughter.]

MR. RAKER. There is nothing like a concrete case. You have got the question as far as I have gone, Mr. Davis, without repeating it?

MR. DAVIS. I haven't heard any question yet.

MR. RAKER. I was just slightly interrupted.

MR. DAVIS. I have heard you so far.

MR. RAKER. Now, the same argument and the same reasons would apply as you have already given, and these propositions could be handled by one farm adviser or superintendent or whatever you would call him, just as well as though it was all in one tract, to the end that you might get smaller tracts of land of 10,000 or 15,000 acres, or 5,000 acres, under projects like this, although they are 10 or 15 miles apart. There you would get practically the same results as though it was all in one tract of land, would you not?

MR. DAVIS. I think there would be some difference. Of course the proximity of the different projects would have an effect; it would have an influence.

MR. RAKER. In your view, could that be done? Because that is the topography of nine-tenths of all the land that is going to be used with reference to irrigation projects. There is a mountain between and land that is not accessible of irrigation.

MR. DAVIS. I don't know of any irrigation projects that I want to tackle of less than 10,000 acres. That is enough for a colony.

MR. RAKER. Well, 5,000 acres, if it is 10 miles from the other one, would work just as well, wouldn't it?

MR. DAVIS. It wouldn't work just as well. It would probably do all right, but we haven't built any project so small as that yet in the reclamation service.

MR. RAKER. I know you have not. That is just the reason I am putting this—if from your observation it could not be worked out successfully.

MR. DAVIS. It could be worked probably, but it would not be as advantageous as a large colony. As I say, the overhead is bound to be larger on a small colony than on a large one.

MR. RAKER. Even though they were 10 or 15 miles apart?

MR. DAVIS. Any scattering tends to increase the cost, of course, necessarily, and it also, to a certain extent, involves the difficulty that Dr. Mead described of mixing this colony with people in more prosperous conditions. That is one of the psychological reasons.

Mr. RAKER. I just wanted to call your attention to the fact that in 1909 the National Irrigation Congress recommended this sort of a plan for the development of our arid West, although all the present projects were practically established, and there hasn't been any difference of opinion upon that resolution enunciated by that congress as to the method of developing the western lands, and I just wondered whether or not you had given sufficient consideration to the question of whether it would make any material difference and whether or not tracts located as I have specified, several tracts, could not practically be used at the same time.

Mr. DAVIS. I presume that tracts 15 miles apart, as you have said, could be worked together all right.

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, I have given some of the reasons—the economy of construction, preparing the farm, that the farmer has to undertake and pay for—as an argument in favor of the colony. Now, there is one other equally as strong, and in some respects stronger, regarding cooperation in marketing. When I went to southern California, in 1891, the citrus industry there was practically a failure. Although they could raise oranges and lemons all right, they frequently fell down in their marketing. Since then they have worked out a wonderful cooperative scheme for marketing, and it has changed the whole face of things. The same kind of an enterprise is in operation for the marketing of fruits in the State of Washington and various other parts of the country. I think they have one in Colorado. They have illustrated, they have blazed the way by which we know that having larger ramifications and a larger organization, still more of that kind of cooperation could be and would be introduced by the Government, so that by cooperative marketing, cutting out a great deal of the expense of handling, a great deal of unnecessary transportation, we would secure not only higher prices for the producer but lower prices to the consumer.

As an illustration, take the city of Washington. We are paying more than twice as much for our milk as the producer gets. It is costing more to distribute that milk than it does to produce it. We have apartment houses of moderate size in this city through which 16 deliveries go every morning, delivering milk, when one might fill the function more promptly, more satisfactorily, with better results, and with a saving of three-fourths or nine-tenths of the cost of distribution. Now, how Washington is to solve that problem for itself is not my business, but it illustrates a difficulty that pertains to almost everything that the farmer produces, more than to anything else that is produced, because the farmer's products are mostly perishable, like milk and vegetables and fruits, such as they produce and can produce in still greater quantities, and would be consumed in much greater quantities if they could be obtained more cheaply. We will increase the consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables and milk, and that is needed in this country more than any other shortage of food that is threatened—very much more. An illustration of that is what happened in England. Of course, we know the Englishman is a man who doesn't like to be interfered with. He believes in personal liberty, and has for generations. This war came on him with considerable of a shock. The Government had to take hold of a great many things that the Government had previously let alone.

They took over all the transportation lines and a great many things like that, and shortly after they got into the war the medical men pointed out that their milk supply was largely cut off. They got a great deal of milk from Denmark, some from Holland—shipments from the continent were stopped for one reason or another—you know as well as I. They pointed out that more than half their milk supply was cut off and that the babies would die by thousands, hundreds of thousands, if that were not remedied. To remedy that, so far as possible, the Government prohibited the sale of milk except on permit, took possession, and issued permits only to people who needed milk, supplying first people who had children to be served and people who actually needed it, letting those who used milk more as a luxury or merely for taste and did not actually need it, go without. They kept actual statistics, as they always have, on infant mortality, and one-half the milk supply distributed in that way, where it belonged, cut down infant mortality in England more 50 per cent in about two years. That is information that I got from the Red Cross Magazine.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Davis, may I ask you this question? It is one that has been quite acute in my mind, as to whether or not about two-thirds, or practically all of these cooperative organizations such as flour mills and stores, have not failed in the last 10 years?

Mr. DAVIS. I have no statistics on that point. I know there are a great many that have been successful. There are vast cooperative institutions of that kind in Europe.

Mr. RAKER. I am referring now to the United States, if it is not a fact that two-thirds of them in the United States in the last 10 years have failed or gone out of business.

Mr. DAVIS. I think probably that is a very conservative statement, and more than two-thirds of the men who enter any private business fail.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Davis, isn't it a fact that those cooperative associations that have failed, have failed because they were not backed up by sufficient capital to start with?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I couldn't say about that. I suppose there are different causes for each individual case, probably bad management and everything else comes in.

Mr. BENHAM. They are working for the public instead of for themselves. Don't that have something to do with the failure, that the helpers in these cooperative concerns don't have the personal incentive to succeed? Isn't that a very large element of the cause of failure?

Mr. DAVIS. It may be; that is one influence.

Mr. RAKER. I was just simply asking that question because it has been brought home to me very vividly in the 10 or 15 that are within my own personal knowledge. I just wanted to ask you as to the community settlement, say now of 100 families on one of these projects. If the Government secured the live stock, the sire or the bull, might they not get into a row, one would want one kind of stock, and one would want another and you would have the community in a constant turmoil as to what particular kind of live stock they wanted? You see that every day.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no doubt there would be a chance for the exercise of tact in carrying out this law. I thoroughly appreciate that

it has got to be done tactfully and skillfully, but when the public mind becomes convinced that that is the effort, my experience is that people become very charitable toward mistakes, if they believe the effort is honest. I have found that to be a fact, a principle which has led me to have a very much higher regard for mankind in general than I once had, because, knowing that squabbling is very frequently due to bad service of one kind or another——

Mr. WHITE (interposing). I would like to ask Mr. Davis one question. Would the colonies be eligible to membership in these marketing associations? Would there be any difficulty in getting into them, do you think?

Mr. DAVIS. None whatever. The association is always, whether public or not, anxious to take in all the memberships they possibly can. The chief difficulty is to get people to come in, and I have known of associations that failed for lack of doing that.

Mr. WHITE. I was speaking of the marketing of fruit, the Fruit Growers' Association as it exists in the extreme western cities.

Mr. DAVIS. I know of none of those that are exclusive. They have great difficulty in getting the fruit growers to unite and join the association, and that has been the cause of failure in some of them, to my knowledge.

Mr. WHITE. Are those organizations for the purpose of stabilizing and maintaining prices at fixed standards?

Mr. DAVIS. They are principally for the purpose of cutting out the expenses of distribution and the expense of handling, cutting out the profits of the commission man, and the unscrupulous methods of the commission man largely. For example, sometimes a carload of citrus fruit will be shipped from California to Chicago. It goes there and it encounters a market that everybody else has rushed into at the same time, and they glut the market for a few days, and the price falls, and the oranges may be thrown into the lake for lack of a place to store them, and because there is no sale for them. The same is true of other fruits that are perishable. There are other fruits that are more perishable than oranges, but that happens sometimes to them. Now, an agent that profitable skillful, will keep in touch with the market, and if a carload of oranges is shipped into Chicago and he finds that the market is bad there he can divert that car to some other market that is not glutted and avoid that condition. Where one market is glutted, he will throw the shipment to another market where conditions are better. Now, without any cooperation as to what they are doing, it frequently occurs with all kinds of perishable products, vegetables, and perishable fruits, that the market is glutted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Hood River apple growers keep a representative in New York continuously all during the apple season, just for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to bring that out. I would like to ask Mr. Davis this question, if I may? Do you think that in the purchase of this live stock and this marketing and distribution to the different projects you could combine the duties of the agricultural instructor and the buyer of live stock?

Mr. DAVIS. In some cases. It would depend on the individual.

Mr. WHITE. You know what wonderful genius and skill it takes—you know it takes a man almost a lifetime to learn the stock business, to be a good judge of the different kinds of stock.

Mr. DAVIS. That is absolutely true; but the man who has acquired that genius, I might say, or that high degree of skill, might also be a good agricultural developer, and for a small colony the same man might possibly fill the two functions. It is mainly a question of the individual. On a large colony, of course, he could not do it, because there would be too much for him to do, but in a small one that might possibly be done in some cases.

Now, the advantages of cooperation in construction and preparation, in education and in marketing, are the advantages of cooperation on that side. On the other side is this point: We can buy tracts of land at \$4, or \$5, or \$6, or \$8, or \$10 an acre in 50,000-acre tracts, and there are some localities where I believe this can be done, where a tract, say, 40,000 acres can be purchased in a holding that is five or ten times that large and purchased at a very low price because of the advantage there would be to the landholders to have their adjacent land increased in value, and it is the purpose of the department, if this is done, if this bill goes through, to exercise every possible influence and pressure to obtain this land at a reasonable price and prevent profiteering, and such influence can be used in that way. Now, the reason this land is so cheap is because it is somewhat isolated, although it may have, as some of the tracts have, two great trunk-line railroads built right through them. There are practically no settlements there, and by putting a settlement of one or two or three or four hundred families there we create a value mainly in that tract itself, and these soldiers get the advantage. There we have by this arrangement provided that the increase of values caused by the presence of the individual accrues to those individuals themselves, because they themselves are the settlers. Now, if you go into a settled community and buy one farm that individual either has to take a farm where he has no neighbors and has no community advantages or he has to pay for that advantage in the value of the farm; one or the other. In these colonies we propose that all the community advantages shall be put there by the men themselves. They form the community, and the single taxpayer's dream of having the value of land that attaches by reason of the presence of the community go to the community, will be accomplished in that way without abolishing title.

Mr. SNELL. Won't it cost as much to build up a community, to build up all of the things that go into a small village, churches, schools, roads, etc.—won't as much be distributed on the farms sufficient to pay that increment if you went out and bought an isolated farm 3 miles from the village in a settled country?

Mr. DAVIS. Those particular functions that you speak of would cost just as much, probably—not quite as much on account of the cooperative reasons that I have mentioned. But those things do not alone create value. It is the presence of the population that creates value, and one individual can only imperceptibly affect values by going to the community or leaving it. The things that he does, of course, do contribute, but those things would themselves lose value to the people left. If all the people left New York on account of a pestilence or the presence of an enemy, anything like that, not

only the land would be without value but the improvements would be almost without value.

Mr. SNELL. Has your department made any special investigation on any special project that they would be ready to start this on at the present time?

Mr. DAVIS. We have made investigations in the West to a point where we are ready to begin work, but the law at the present time, up to the present time, has not been such that we could carry them to that point of completion in the East. We have not had the authority.

Mr. SNELL. How many projects have you that you are all ready to start work on, provided this should become a law?

Mr. DAVIS. I could not answer that offhand. I should say that we could, within a few months, start work on not less than a dozen projects, and probably could double that within a year. I don't think there are any that we could start right away on. We would have to buy rights of way and would have to make contracts, advertise for bids, and make some detailed investigations, perhaps, in any case. But in some cases we would be able to begin work within a few months.

Mr. SNELL. Would this be a proper question to ask now: Where the most feasible one is—the first one?

Mr. DAVIS. I could not answer that question.

Mr. SNELL. I didn't know whether that was a proper question.

Mr. DAVIS. I couldn't answer that.

Mr. VAILE. In that connection, Mr. Director, some gentlemen seem to be infected with the fear that this plan of this soldier settlement bill is to develop large reclamation projects in the West and South to the exclusion of other parts of the country. That is the statement, but do you have in mind any territory in the eastern part of the country or the northeastern part of the country where these plans could be carried out—where this plan contemplated by this bill could be carried out?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; there are many of them in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey that we know of.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are there any of them in the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. DAVIS. There are large areas of undeveloped lands in the Mississippi Valley. You mean the valley in Illinois and Iowa?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not able to designate specific tracts in those States, but we know there are about 200,000 acres in Illinois and about 400,000 in Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are there any in Indiana?

Mr. DAVIS. I am informed there are. Our funds and our time have been so meager that we have not been able to get around over all the country and we have not covered those States thoroughly at all, but two of my associates, Dr. Mead and Mr. Cory, have assured me that colonies of this kind can be established in Indiana, and they are both Indiana men and I think they know.

Mr. VAILE. Now, still further along the same line, would the development of lands in the central part of the country or the East,

by fertilizing them, be analogous, in your judgment, to the expenditure of similar amounts for irrigation of western lands?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. Reclamation, as used by this bill, I interpret to be irrigation of arid lands, drainage of wet lands, or their protection by diking, the clearing and leveling of cut-over lands, the application of lime instead of water, if that is the thing to do; the application of phosphates, if that is what the land needs; the application of nitrates, if that is what the land needs—and, in fact, most land will need two or more kinds of treatment out of that list of methods of reclamation. Practically all of the western lands need not only irrigation but the addition of nitrates. Nearly all of the eastern lands, so far as it is not in limestone regions, need the addition of lime, and much of it needs the addition of phosphates. Some of it needs water taken off and some does not, and even the land that is to be cleared of stumps, much of that needs drainage also.

Mr. VAILE. I merely wanted to bring out the point that the term "reclamation" does not apply solely to the irrigation of arid lands.

Mr. DAVIS. Not by any means. There are large areas that I have seen myself that looked feasible to me for reclamation in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Some of these areas need some leveling, and some of them need drainage, and some need clearing of brush and stumps.

Mr. RAKER. Would the provisions of this bill authorize the department to take over, say, 50,000 or 75,000 acres of developed agricultural land to-day and subdivide this land for farms for soldiers, which did not meet either of the three conditions?

Mr. DAVIS. So far as the wording of the bill is concerned, it would. I think there would be few cases of that kind, such as you have mentioned, because where land is properly developed it is generally very high priced.

Mr. ELSTON. You instanced one case in New York, Mr. Davis, when you were here before.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. Neglected land that needs drainage, phosphates, most of it, and nitrogen, all of it—that land needs reclamation, in my judgment.

Mr. RAKER. Under the provisions of this bill the department would not be prohibited from taking a tract or tracts which would aggregate 75 or 100 thousand acres of good farm land?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And dividing it up into tracts of 20 to 100 acres, and improving it in the way of fencing and putting houses on it, and then throwing it open for settlement by soldiers.

Mr. DAVIS. There are instances that I know of in the Middle States where there are large areas held by landlords, alien or otherwise, and farmed by tenants. Those lands are generally going down in fertility as the result of tenant farming.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is that true of Kansas or Nebraska, do you know?

Mr. DAVIS. To some extent it is, and I know it is true in Illinois. That is my State.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean there are projects in Illinois?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I don't know how reasonably these lands can be purchased. I am simply instancing that as a class of development

which might be carried out if it can be done within feasible limits of cost.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Director, are you familiar with the Irish adjustment of their lands over there within the last 10 years?

Mr. DAVIS. I can not say that I am familiar with it. I know something of it.

Mr. RAKER. Is there any way that you could get just the provisions of what was done, and how they are doing it, the manner in which the English Government bought the land where these people took land, so that you can put that in the record?

Mr. DAVIS. I think so. I am not sure that I have it in my office, but I think I can get it from the Australian commission that went over there. They examined that and published a report on the subject. Probably that is obtainable.

ENGLAND.

In England by the small holdings act of 1907 county councils are authorized to purchase or condemn large estates and subdivide them into small tracts to be sold. The purchaser pays one-fifth down and the balance is spread over a term of 50 years. The money to buy the land and subdivide is loaned by the public works land commissioners at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The average cost of land acquired under this act was less than \$100 per acre. The cost of preparing them for sale to small holders has averaged \$10 per acre. During 1908 and 1909 60,889 acres were acquired under the act. Of this area, 34,234 acres were sold in small holdings and 26,655 acres were leased.

IRELAND.

The estates commission and the congested districts board are commissions nominated by the Government and have for their object the division and sale of estates. The procedure is as follows: A large estate is put up for sale and appraised. If the price asked by the owner is satisfactory the estate is purchased and the owner is paid in Government land script, or stock bearing 3 per cent interest. Estates sold under compulsion the Government must pay in cash. The estate is then divided into tracts of 25 to 30 acres, line walls are built if necessary, a house is constructed at a cost of about \$1,000, and the place is sold to a tenant. The land is sold to the small holders at a price not to exceed the purchase price. Frequently it is sold for less. The small holder pays 3 per cent interest at present on the purchase price and $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent amortization, payable in semi-annual installments. This rate amortizes the debt in about 62 years. The purchaser is given a title to the land, pays the taxes on it, and may transfer his equity at any time if he chooses.

The local authorities (county councils, etc.) may advance money for the purchase of the property which a tenant occupies to the extent of four-fifths of the purchase price, a limit of \$1,600 being placed on the loan. The amount so advanced must be repaid within 30 years. Installments of such repayments are of equal amounts and may be weekly, monthly, or semiannual. The installments are inclusive of interest, the rate of which varies according to the rate at which the money is borrowed for the purpose by the local government, and the only charge for the service in 10 shillings in addition to the interest.

SCOTLAND.

The same law applies to Scotland with only minor modifications. The small holdings act is proving a great success in promoting intensive cultivation, dairying, stock raising, etc.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Davis, one further question; several witnesses who have appeared before this committee seemed to have the idea that there is something inherently wrong or fallacious in combining the two ideas of benefit for the soldier and reclamation. They seemed

to think there was something inconsistent in those two ideas. Do you care to make any comment on that proposition?

Mr. DAVIS. The bill and the advocates of this bill frankly combine the two things, because they are by no means inconsistent. They are almost necessarily hitched together. If we are going to overcome the crowding of the cities at all, which is practically the same proposition, it means some further rural development. The settlement of soldiers upon new lands may be and probably will be more beneficial to them than settlement on older lands, unless the older lands are built up to the condition that the new lands are in the state of nature. Most people know that old lands were at one time, when they were new lands, in better shape than they are now, more productive. That is true in New England lands; it is true of New York lands, and it is true of practically all of the lands of the country, except the swamp lands themselves, and even they need the addition nearly always of lime.

But farming the land takes plant food out of the land, out of the ground, and if you don't put something back, the land is bound to deteriorate, and in the West one of the advantages of irrigation farming is that those lands have not been leached by centuries and centuries of excessive rainfall, which percolates through and carries away the soluble plant food, and for that reason in mineral plant food the arid lands are richer than the humid lands, almost universally, unless the humid lands are undrained. Now, leaching involves the draining away of soluble elements, and, of course, if you have swamp lands where those elements can not drain out, they don't get away as they do in the uplands, but for that reason there is more mineral-plant food in most of the arid land than there is in the humid land. For the same reason, the presence of moisture, more vegetation has grown in the East, and the eastern lands are not so likely to be deficient in humus or nitrogen as the western lands, which are almost universally deficient in humus, which must be put in there. But nearly all of the lands of the country will stand the addition of phosphates, and we have an abundance of phosphates in the Carolinas, in Florida, in Utah, and Idaho, and various parts of the country. We have a majority of the phosphates of the world, I believe, right in the United States, and there is another element of possible cooperation in the selection, the preparation, the shipping, and the application of lime and phosphates to the lands. That is extensively needed. The individual can not do that to nearly as good an advantage as it can be done in large tracts.

Mr. WHITE. I have heard it stated by a great many farmers in Iowa, where I was raised, and where I have passed through frequently, that by a system of rotation and soiling they have made their lands more productive than they were originally. What do you know about that?

Mr. DAVIS. That can be done.

Mr. WHITE. The application of these progressive methods that are now in use by the Iowa farmers would be highly beneficial, would they not, all over the country?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Wouldn't the soil generally respond to that?

Mr. DAVIS. Those methods have not been very generally applied in Iowa. They are beginning it and a few people have done it.

Mr. WHITE. You mean in the country generally or in Iowa, you say?

Mr. DAVIS. In Iowa.

Mr. WHITE. I thought it had been brought to a very high stage there.

Mr. DAVIS. The reason I speak so positively is that one of my associates, who in fact had charge of all the investigations in the northern States under me, Mr. Hanna is an Iowa farmer, brought up on a farm and he still runs an Iowa farm and has a very fine herd of short horns, and I hope we will have his services—he has just completed his report and I have it here. I hope we will have his services in carrying out this law if it passes. He tells me they are beginning, that a few farmers have used these up-to-date methods.

Mr. WHITE. I think in my locality, if you will pardon me, Mr. Director, that they have pursued the system to a very high degree of success.

Mr. DAVIS. Doubtless there is a difference in different parts of the State.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Davis, have you any statistics that tell what proportion of the farm lands of the country are occupied by what we call "tenant farmers" at the present time?

Mr. DAVIS. I haven't got that in mind. I know that tenant farming is growing, as every census has shown. I know some communities where the excess of tenants is very great—that is, I have in mind one community where two-thirds of the land is farmed by tenants.

Mr. SNELL. Would you venture a guess as to the number of farms in the country?

Mr. DAVIS. I would rather not from memory. According to the Agricultural Department in 1918, there were 6,717,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the Agricultural Department has statistics on that.

Mr. SNELL. Do you know what it is?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; but we are sending for the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think he can tell us.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is a good thing to know.

Mr. WHITE. Would you care to say, Mr. Davis, in your opinion, what proportion of soldiers, returning soldiers, from the city as compared with the country, might avail themselves of the opportunities presented by this legislation?

Mr. DAVIS. The distribution of those soldiers is shown on a list that I have here. We have received, up to June 7, four days ago, applications from 57,463 soldiers on the form that the department submitted for the purpose.

Mr. SNELL. What do you mean by "application"?

Mr. DAVIS. I mean that signed questionnaire (indicating paper).

Mr. SNELL. They have filled out that questionnaire that says on the top of it: "Would you like to have a home of your own?"

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; that is the questionnaire.

Mr. SNELL. Does that necessarily mean that they are going to want a farm?

Mr. RAKER. I would like to see the original of that if you have one?

Mr. DAVIS. The first thousand of the cards received was analyzed, and assuming that that is representative of the whole, we have of that thousand 442 whose occupation was farming.

Mr. WHITE. Previous to the war?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. Five hundred and fifty-eight who were not; and of the thousand, 884 had had some farming experience, had been raised on a farm or worked on a farm, or something of that kind. That is the best statistics we have on it. We have been so overwhelmed by these—I spoke of their being 57,000 who have returned this questionnaire with their signature attached, giving their desire. That was the correct number four days ago. The day following when this was made up we received about 1,100. I think the number is doubtless now over 60,000. Besides that, there have been over 12,000 individual and written letters received, written at the soldier's own initiative. We don't count them because it contains many duplicates. We would be duplicating if we did, and we don't know how many there are. We have not run it down to find out how many—probably half of those people are people who have seen this questionnaire, but a large number heard about it indirectly and have written about it.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Davis, if you had sent out a statement reading something like this in the heading, sent them out to 250,000 soldiers: "Do you want \$5,000?" and then show up in your questions how it would be possible for them to get that \$5,000, how many answers to your communication would you probably get?

Mr. VAILE. That would be unanimous.

Mr. DAVIS. It depends on how easy it would be to get. If they had to earn it, probably we wouldn't have very many—not many more than we got by the other. If it would be given to them, probably a large number would have been obtained.

Mr. HERSMAN. Can I ask you a question there? Provided this law goes into effect, how soon could you get these soldiers to work, or offer them an opportunity to get to work, say, the 50,000 soldiers that you have applications from? That is one-quarter or one-fifth of what you have sent out questionnaires to. Now, how soon could you give these 50,000 soldiers an opportunity to really get to work on one of these projects, or a number of these projects?

Mr. DAVIS. As near as I can answer that question, I would say within a few weeks.

Mr. HERSMAN. Fifty thousand within a few weeks?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNELL. I thought you said a few minutes ago that it would be three or four months before you could get ready to start to work on one of these projects.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, there is not much difference.

Mr. SNELL. Three or four months as against two or three weeks.

Mr. DAVIS. No; I said a few weeks.

Mr. SNELL. Well, I misunderstood you.

Mr. DAVIS. I would better say a few months.

Mr. WHITE. Do you have a force of men in the present personnel of the department who are qualified to take over some of these projects at the present time?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; we have an organization now operating and continuing construction on 22 projects in the West. They are distributed in 15 different States, and among those men are a large number who are competent for promotion, the principal men in the service—take half a dozen of the higher men in the service have a large acquaintance of men whose qualifications they know, whom they would know where to place to make successes of them, and that is one of the most difficult things, of course, to accomplish.

Mr. WHITE. Could they be spared from their present work in sufficient numbers without impairing the service of the department, do you think?

Mr. DAVIS. Not in sufficient numbers. It will be necessary, of course, to employ a great many new men.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. A great many of these men returning from the Army, these engineers, would be available, too.

Mr. DAVIS. Many of them; yes, sir. Some of them who left our service.

On the point of the ease of obtaining this, the impression has gone out that some people think that the soldier has been led to believe that he is going to be given a farm, and I have heard quotations made of the title: "Do You Want a Home on a Farm?" But in that questionnaire it contains this question:

Does the Government give me this farm for nothing?

The answer is:

No; and you would not want the Government to do it. The plan is to arrange for you to pay for your farm home in small payments over a long term of years, with interest charges at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

How about the stock and farm implements?

Answer. It is planned that the Government will also furnish you with the necessary stock and farm implements, to be paid for by you in small payments spread over several years.

Where will I get the money to make these small payments?

Answer. You should be able to save the amount of the first payment out of your wages while working for the Government helping to build these settlements. The balance you should be able to pay from the proceeds from the sale of your crops.

That is the plan that has been set forth, and the number of people that I have stated are those who have stated they desire to take advantage of this. They have not any of them bound themselves to anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis, about that "Hey, there" poster that was sent out, do you remember during the war there was published all over the country a picture of Uncle Sam and he was pointing at every man and saying, "Hey, there; Uncle Sam needs you?"

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard any sneers about that "Hey, there" on that picture?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. And this word "Hey, there" is quoted from that same poster.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Davis, could I ask you one more question? Assuming that you will have applications enough, and that this law becomes effective, how many soldiers could you take care of, working on these different reclamation schemes within a year? How many soldiers would it be possible to utilize?

Mr. DAVIS. That is a very difficult question to answer. I have made some estimates of the number that can be employed with a certain investment. The experience of the Reclamation Service in the last 16 years in which it has been operating indicates that for an annual expenditure of \$1,400 we have employed an average of one man—that is, we have had a man constantly employed on the average for each \$1,400 spent annually. Now prices are a great deal higher. We can't do that any more, and how much higher they will be when this work is started we can only conjecture. But on that basis—I mean on that principle—reasoning from the same point. I should think it would take \$2,000 or \$2,500 as the divisor: divide that into the total appropriation and the quotient would be the number of men to be employed. That is by and large on the average.

Mr. BENHAM. On the basis of \$2,000 or \$2,500 a year for each agricultural worker, what would probably be the price of wheat to the consumer?

Mr. ELSTON. He don't mean that that is the wage.

Mr. DAVIS. I mean in the construction of reclamation work.

Mr. BENHAM. I understand that, but that must be paid by the man—by the men who are on the farms, and you are setting a price in a given community for farm work when you pay a certain price in that community for reclamation service, are you not?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, the nearest answer I can give you to that, Mr. Benham, is to cite you to the price of wheat when the rate was \$1,400 to the individual. Compare that to the \$2,000 or \$2,500 and you would have that much higher price of wheat—probably from 50 to 75 per cent higher price than the average of the last 15 years.

Mr. BENHAM. Could you assume now that \$1,400 is the price of agricultural labor the country over?

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely not. I made no statement that could be tortured into that. My figure includes right of way, purchase of machinery, payment to contractors for building big dams, and has only a very distant and remote relation to the price of wheat. It is not the price of agricultural products at all; it is the amount of money required to employ certain men on reclamation work. That was given in answer to the question how many men could you employ, and the answer depends upon the size of the appropriation.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Davis, I think you had better explain that very fully. You mean that one man is apportioned to each \$2,000 or \$2,500 of application of this appropriation to work?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. Including construction of every kind, employment of labor, purchase of material, and everything that goes into every item of expenditure under this appropriation, divided into units of \$2,500 each will enable you to employ that many men?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. It has no relationship whatever to the price paid to each individual laborer.

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely not.

Mr. ELSTON. That might be \$800 or \$900 a year, or something else; so I think that should be made very clear; otherwise you will have mistakes about it.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. Your statement is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis, when you testified the other day you said you would divide the country up into three districts.

Mr. DAVIS. I said I had done so in this investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. What States comprised districts 1, 2, and 3?

Mr. DAVIS. The western district as now divided comprises the States that are enumerated in the reclamation law, 17 States, lying, in a general way, west of the Missouri River. The southern district comprises the States lying south of the Ohio River, not including Missouri, which is attached to the northern district, but including Maryland and Delaware, which were attached to the southern district. What the organization will be when an appropriation is passed, of course, I can't predict. It may differ somewhat, but the idea that I had was to report to the committee what had been done in the way of organization.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was in the expenditure—that investigation that Congress authorized you to make?

Mr. DAVIS. That \$100,000; yes, sir.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Davis, suppose you start off with three projects—this question is suggested by one that Mr. Hersman asked—and the bill provides that a soldier who works on a project should be given a preference—now suppose you locate your first three projects, for instance, one in Louisiana, one in Indiana, and one in Arizona. Now there is a man in New York State who wants a farm on one of these projects, but you are not ready to start work up there, but he is willing to go to work, and suppose he should go and work on the Arizona project; then after the New York State project is started and carried through to completion and ready for settlement, could the New York man exercise his preference on the New York project, or would he be confined to the project which he had worked on?

Mr. DAVIS. He could exercise it wherever he chose, undoubtedly, under this bill. There is no doubt in my mind on that point.

Mr. ELSTON. That would be subject to the preference of the individual workers on a particular project to have the first call on the units in that project?

Mr. DAVIS. That is a detail that could be controlled by regulation. I would say that it would be proper and fair to allow a man to exercise his option wherever he chooses. If he goes to one that is particularly popular, he takes his chances with a larger number, and of course he hasn't got as good a chance to get a farm.

Mr. BARBOUR. I understood it was entirely a matter of administration, but I wanted to get your idea on the subject.

Mr. DAVIS. I think it is entirely a matter of administration, but offhand, that would look fairer to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis, do you travel around much investigating these projects, and if so, what was the sentiment you found and what experiences did you have with public sentiment?

Mr. DAVIS. I traveled around to some extent, and met but little opposition.

There was an interesting occurrence in New England. Dr. Elwood Mead, Mr. Hanna, and I visited Boston on the invitation of a committee that has been appointed for New England, and there inspected several tracts of land that were suggested for soldier settlements, and the committee made an appointment for us to meet the

leading men in the city of Springfield. We went to the city of Springfield and met with about 20 of the leading men of that vicinity, mostly members of the chamber of commerce and other prominent men, and when we explained the purpose of our visit, the chairman suggested to his companions:

This is a very important matter and this meeting is not sufficiently representative to give it proper consideration, and I suggest that we urge these gentlemen to come back sometime in the future when we can have a representative New England meeting and thrash this thing all out.

After some parley, we finally agreed upon a date in the month of January. Unexpectedly Dr. Mead was called back to California and Mr. Hanna and I went to Springfield to meet these people. I got there the day of the meeting. They had taken care to have a very representative meeting, inviting all the State granges, the commissioners of agriculture, and the leading manufacturers and the leading journalists of the State, and they had a meeting of about 70 people or more. They met the day before our arrival. We arrived on time, but they wanted to get together and talk it over themselves first, and they did so.

THE CHAIRMAN. Whom do you mean by "they"?

MR. DAVIS. The representatives of the New England interests, various people. And if my information is correct, all of the State granges of New England were represented, I think most of them by the masters of the grange; and the commissioners of agriculture were nearly all there, I think. There were various journalists and manufacturers and the account they gave me of the meeting they had the day before we arrived was that there was almost universal opposition to this Lane plan. They thought it meant the reclamation of two or three hundred million acres of land and the farming of that immediately the location of millions of soldiers thereon, whether the men wanted to go on it or not, and the glutting of the market for farm products, and all of the other things that you have heard charged here against this bill. Those were all charged and honestly believed there. The one or two friends of the movement present could not do more than to beg them to give a hearing on it, and the men who came the next day had denounced it almost universally. I occupied about three-quarters of an hour when the meeting was held in the City Hall, and had an audience of over 100 people and they listened attentively. I explained the plan as you have seen it explained in the literature and as I have explained it here on the floor, and Mr. Hanna followed, giving some of his experiences and detailed observations in his travels, making these investigations which he had been engaged on then for about four months.

When we got through we were followed by, I presume, 15 different speakers—a large number of different speakers, only two of whom opposed the plan—one of them, I think, was master of the State grange of Massachusetts—he was at least master of a grange, and I do not remember his name—he said that he had violently opposed the plan the day before, but was now in favor of it, and that his opposition was based wholly upon a misconception and misinformation.

After the meeting the chairman, who is the State forester, Mr. Rane, who was very friendly from the first to this project, told me that the tone of that meeting was absolutely opposite to what it was

at the meeting before; that instead of there being any commendation, as we had received that day, there had only been opposition the day before, and that the situation was entirely revolutionized, due to the fact that now they had the information. The representatives of the grange particularly flocked around Mr. Hanna and me—and I think all of the granges were represented there—all those who talked to us privately told us that their opposition was based entirely upon misinformation, and they showed us the newspaper articles which had misled them to the effect that the soldier was to be sent on to a farm without any experience; that he was to be sent there, whether he wanted to go or not; that a man was to be dragged from New York and sent into the swamps of the South, and that it was a scheme for reclaiming hundreds of millions of acres of land that would be thrown into competition with the New England agriculturists and put them into a worse position than they were at the opening of the homestead act, to which some of them referred.

The tenor of that meeting was an appreciation of the condition that the agriculture of New England does not supply more than 25 per cent of the demand of New England for agricultural products, and that it is a very serious handicap upon all the industries of New England to have to ship most of its supplies from the far West or from Canada. They import milk from Canada, and they import a good deal of milk to Boston from up and down the coast, both south and north, some from Maine. And their idea was that the plan as outlined, with the appropriation then proposed, which was \$100,000,000—as you will remember, \$100,000,000 for the first year—and I pointed out to them that if that appropriation, the same appropriation, were kept up annually for a period of ten years, which would be double the amount provided in this bill, it would not supply the deficiency in the farm area that the census from 1900 to 1910 showed. That census shows that the population increased 20 per cent; the number of farms increased only 11 per cent, and the cultivated area increased only 15 per cent, showing a shortage of 5 per cent in agricultural area. Now, \$500,000,000 may add 4,000,000 acres to the cultivated area, part of which is now partly cultivated, of course, if you take some of these partially developed areas, as we expect to do. Now that increases the cultivated area only about 1½ per cent; it only supplies about one-third of the lack of the growth of agriculture to keep pace with population. To the extent that it applies, it also tends to overcome the rush to the cities and to make country life more attractive, thereby attracting people to that line of industry. But if that is not undertaken in some form, the tendency to city congestion is growing right straight along, it has been throughout the past, but the indications all are that it will go along until the cities—congestion in the cities and congestion in other occupations, where people like to flock together—is going to be such as to create a great shortage of farm products. Some people are alarmed at it already.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you, Mr. Director, if you find any strong sentiment of jealousy anywhere among the farmers against this scheme on the ground that it might bring in competition with their products?

Mr. DAVIS. I have not, among the farmers themselves, found any of that. I have talked with a great many and I don't recall talking

with any who have expressed such an opinion. What I have heard has been from the man who appeared before us here representing the grange. It seemed to me there was such a spirit in his talk, if I may be pardoned.

Mr. WHITE. I am asking for information. I have very pronounced views of it, as far as my own section of the country is concerned. I don't think there is any jealousy among our people at all. There is absolute fraternity, so far as they are concerned.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the situation that I find in the West, and that is where I have circulated most and am best acquainted, but I have traveled through the East to some extent, and I want to say this, that my assistant, Mr. Hanna, who had charge in the northern district, and is, as I say, himself a farmer—all of his belongings are invested in farming, and he thoroughly agrees with all this reasoning and applied it in his speech in Springfield—he says it is absolutely trivial and ridiculous to talk about upsetting the market for agricultural products.

The movement is not large enough for that, even if it were feasible to do it. It is not large enough. And we are starting, as I hope Congress will start, on a basis that can succeed. There isn't anything that I want any more than success for this movement, and if it can be achieved, if those who are best able to judge can achieve success better by firing me, that is what I want them to do. It is not the job I want, but the success of this enterprise, and that is the reason that I oppose the infiltration method of settlement, because, gentlemen, that can not succeed. Neither can a 100 per cent loan succeed. It is not a commercial proposition.

Mr. BENHAM. How do you necessarily associate those two ideas?

Mr. DAVIS. They have usually been associated—not necessarily, but usually they have been. That was the proposition of at least two of those who favored that before this committee, and I think others.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Davis, if you will pardon another question: Don't you believe that in cases like, we will say—not a hypothetical case, but thousands of which will exist—a young man has gone into the military service; he is the son of a rather poor farmer, who may be poor for a hundred different reasons which it is not necessary to catalogue or discuss—he comes back with enlarged ideas, enlarged ambitions, and yet he would like to settle in his own neighborhood. Would you object to the Secretary having the jurisdiction in a case like that, where the young man was thoroughly familiar with the existing conditions, the quality of the soil, and has had a lifetime of experience, in order to keep him out of the city to give the Secretary the jurisdiction to, under supervision, settle him there, paying, say, 40 per cent or 25 per cent on a limited investment?

Mr. DAVIS. My answer to that question would be the same, that the Federal Land Board could give him assistance. There is no objection to the legislation, but it wants to be thoroughly understood that it is not our idea. We don't want to be sponsor for its failure.

Mr. WHITE. That answers my question.

Mr. DAVIS. I think it should be in separate legislation. If Congress desires to give recognition to the soldier in any such line as that, of course, I have no personal objection to it. It is not, however, and can not be made, in my opinion, and the opinion of those who

have tried it—it can not be made a solvent proposition, and so far as I am concerned, so far as Secretary Lane is concerned, so far as the sponsor of this measure are concerned, they desire it to be kept purely and simply a solvent proposition that shall pay its way so far as it is humanly feasible to make it do so, and not contemplate any special privilege—I should not use that term; I mean any gratuity—

Mr. MAYS (interposing). Gratuity?

Mr. TAYLOR. You don't mean to contemplate a bounty proposition?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. White did not necessarily imply a bounty proposition; he suggested a loan.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. WHITE. Pardon me, another word—I didn't intend to pursue this subject. I wanted your position, I wanted to ask you a question, and it is answered satisfactorily, but I want to make myself clear on one proposition. My question didn't contemplate any gratuity or any bounty. It contemplated safeguarding the Government absolutely, and I would not favor any other proposition. I am not here to contest or combat the directors' views. I am merely trying to get an answer to the question.

Mr. DAVIS. My idea is this: That if such an enterprise is undertaken, it should be in separate legislation and might best be handled, I think, in view of their organization, by the Federal Farm Loan Board through some provision by which public funds could be used, probably from the sale of bonds, with a low rate of interest. Some such plan as that might be carried out.

Mr. HERSMAN. Doesn't the Federal Farm Loan Board at the present time take care of those cases, not extending such large credits, but they take care of exactly those kind of cases?

Mr. ELSTON. They give as high credit as Mr. White mentioned—as high as 50 per cent.

Mr. HERSMAN. The Federal Farm Loan Board gives 50 per cent on the appraised value of the land, and 20 per cent on the insured value of the improvements on the land.

Mr. DAVIS. That makes less than 50 per cent on the total.

Mr. HERSMAN. That makes a little less than 50 per cent on the total.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. White mentioned 25 per cent to 40 per cent.

Mr. DAVIS. And they charge higher interest also.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Director, in reading this bill closely, don't you find that if the Secretary desires to exercise his discretion, he has that power in this bill. Now, the very one that Mr. White asked about? Doesn't it say so in so many words, that that power is vested in him?

Mr. DAVIS. The bill places no minimum on the size of projects.

Mr. JOHNSON. It does not.

Mr. DAVIS. I have my doubts, though, about that.

Mr. WHITE. I did not raise this question, Mr. Chairman, in order to discuss it. It can be discussed in executive session.

Mr. FERRIS. Just a moment there—if that meaning is intended, it ought to be clarified: if it is not intended, we ought to have Mr. Davis's view very emphatically on it. What do you say as to the suggestion of Mr. Johnson?

Mr. DAVIS. There is no minimum placed on the size of a project by this bill, and I think that is wise, but—

Mr. FERRIS (interposing). Now, is it intended, then—that statement corroborates Mr. Johnson's statement, and I have had that same thing in mind—then, is it intended by this proposed legislation to, in cases like the one instanced by Mr. White, to meet an emergency of that sort?

Mr. DAVIS. I think not. I don't think that any legal officer would hold—I certainly did not hold that this bill authorizes the purchase and settlement of a single or even three or four individuals in one locality. It speaks of "projects" and authorizes "projects." Such a settlement could scarcely be called a project. Just where to draw the line, of course, will be a matter of executive discretion, and the holding would be, I believe, that it would be a matter of opinion as to whether it could be made solvent, for it certainly is the intent of this legislation that it shall be solvent; and such small holdings, unless under very exceptional circumstances, could not be so made under the provisions of this bill. This bill authorizes very large credits; it authorizes 95 per cent credit on the land and it authorizes 75 per cent credit on the improvements and 60 per cent credit on personal property, and that is higher than any commercial organization can carry on successfully, and it means that in order to be solvent they must have special advantages of some kind. One of those I have enumerated is the advantage of enjoying the difference in value caused by the community coming there. Their own presence adds value to that land that it would not otherwise have, giving the Government a wider margin and giving them the social advantages that they do not have to pay for.

Mr. FERRIS. What harm would it do to put in an alternative proposal, giving the Secretary the power in a given State where a project plan was not feasible? I think you will find there are some States where there are no feasible projects.

Mr. DAVIS. There may be States where projects are not feasible.

Mr. FERRIS. What harm would it do to give the Secretary an alternative of making loans along the line of the Farm Loan Board, only with greater liberality both as to tenure and rate, so that you would be able to reach a larger percentage of the soldiers who need it and deserve the benefit from this?

Mr. BENHAM. You would do that in order to catch the young birds, I assume, Mr. Ferris?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, I don't know what you mean by that. I put it in because I believe the soldier is entitled to it.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Davis already stated that that would not meet with our approval and we would not back it up; so why put it in if it doesn't mean anything?

Mr. FERRIS. Now, the gentleman from Indiana has no right to make any such remark as that. I asked the director a question, and it is a fair question, and I may have an answer to that, I think.

Mr. DAVIS. I will be glad to answer. My objection to that, Mr. Chairman, is this: If such a paragraph is put in, it will show that it was the intent of Congress to inaugurate the infiltration method that I have described to you; that is, a method of scattering settlers all over the country and carrying it out under this bill. Such a plan

can not be made solvent. If that were the intent of Congress, the pressure would undoubtedly be so great that I don't believe any Secretary of the Interior could resist making that kind of settlements in various spots in the country, and it would fail. That is the reason I am opposed to it.

Mr. FERRIS. They sell Indian land, they sell Government trust land, reserve land, in isolated tracts, Mr. Davis, and they sell it on payments, and they sell it without the colony proposition, and they have settled great States—the West has been settled in that way. Homesteaders have not take up land in colonies; they have taken it up here and there.

Mr. DAVIS. And a vast number of them have failed.

Mr. FERRIS. True; but you look at the West as a whole, and it has not failed.

Mr. DAVIS. I don't mean that the country could not be settled in that way.

Mr. FERRIS. Homes can be acquired in that way, can they not?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. If homes are acquired in that way, and the country is settled in that way, and unproductive areas are reduced to production in that way, it is not a failure in toto.

Mr. DAVIS. Not in toto, but the failure I refer to is financial failure. The Government will have a large per cent of failures which will not be able to pay the money due, in my judgment, if that is tried. Now just where the line should be drawn between the colony that is small and the one that is large enough to succeed, is a question that I can not answer now, but the men best competent to answer that question have placed the minimum at 100 families.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Your idea, Mr. Davis, is that it would not be safe for the Government to pay the market value of the farm and put a man on there without any capital at all?

Mr. DAVIS. That is the idea; yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. From a business standpoint, it would not be feasible.

Mr. WHITE. Now, I want it distinctly understood by this committee and by the director that I have never advanced a proposition of any kind in this committee. I brought out some questions but by no inference have I ever suggested that I would want the Government to pay the market price of the land.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is what you would have to pay in a settled community.

Mr. WHITE. Well, that is a question of opinion. I don't want to consume the time of this committee in argument now, but there are millions of dollars worth of real estate changing hands on time every week and every month and every year.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. At market value?

Mr. WHITE. Changing hands at market values, but changing hands on time.

Mr. MAYS. With the interest charge added.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. That is paying the market value?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly; but I have not even suggested that the Government should do it, but your reclamation scheme contemplates that very thing. I don't want to argue the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a question, Mr. Benham?

Mr. BENHAM. Well, I don't know that it is valuable, but in private conversation a short time ago with Mr. Davis, he told me that the reclamation projects are, some of them, carried out on by direct Government agencies, and some by private contract, or Government contract with private individuals. Now, I do not know what his experience is, but I felt like asking which of those systems has cost the Government most. My observation in the improvements on the Ohio and other rivers is that the Government has been more successful from a financial standpoint when it could contract the work. In short, when private enterprise has done the public work, it has been done at less cost to the Government than when the Government has taken it over directly. Now, is, or, is not, that true of our reclamation projects?

Mr. DAVIS. That is a question that is difficult to answer, and is a very important question, and I am glad to answer it, because it is one of which we have made a great deal of investigation. We require on all projects specific reports on those things at various periods, and we publish the results in our annual reports. An illustration that I will give right now is one that is to-day in progress. We are doing drainage work in the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico. We have a number of machines there that we purchased, and are being run by men paid by the month, by the Reclamation Service. We also advertised—I think we advertised twice—at any rate we made very extensive inquiry and advertised to let that work by contract, and finally when we found a man who would bid, or men who would bid, we advertised and let the contract. The work that is going on in that valley now by contracts costs $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents per cubic yard, by measure; the work that is being done by the Government, the monthly reports show costs between 6 and 7 cents per cubic yard, done on exactly the same basis. In a public meeting in that valley not long ago one of the water users said this: "The Reclamation Service let a contract for this drainage work to show that they can do the work cheaper than the contractor could." Now, why not admit it and stop that contractor and get this work done cheaper?

Mr. BENHAM. That is an isolated case, but is that the general experience?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it is not. I have not finished, if you will allow me to. It is not possible to exactly and positively answer your question, for the reason that the same work can not be done in two different ways. There is a case where the work is just as nearly of the same character as any that you could find, I think, but we found this in two canals in the same valley; we did part of it by contract and part of it by force account, and the force-account work was cheaper in some cases, and in some cases it turned out the other way. But the only cases in which you can best make a comparison are these where we advertise for contracts, get a variety of bids, reject those bids, and do the work ourselves. We do the work that we are doing cheaper than we could have done it by contract. That doesn't prove that the contractor could have done it for that money, because many of our contractors fail, but I don't recall any case where we have advertised under sealed bids and afterwards done the work by force account that it cost more than the bids. But usually those bids are rejected because they are too high, and, of course, that in turn is not a

very fair comparison. It is an advantage to the Government, because here is the judgment of the men who know most about it, who say that work can be done cheaper. That doesn't mean that we can do the work cheaper than it would cost the contractor, necessarily, and the answer to the question that I understand you want to bring out is as to what the policy will be and why. Is that not it?

Mr. BENHAM. That is it.

Mr. DAVIS. The policy at present is to contract those things that can most advantageously be done by a contractor, such as straight-away canal work that can be very easily estimated and carried on by ordinary methods and has not much—

Mr. BENHAM (interposing). Excuse me just a moment—the question I was trying to finally lead up to is this: Will the farm products cost the farmer, the boy who is expected to use it—will it cost him more or less than the same proposition would cost him by private enterprise?

Mr. DAVIS. Unless it costs him less, it will be mismanagement, because the Government is a bigger body, can do it on a large scale and by wholesale and has better credit than a private party.

Mr. BENHAM. Isn't that the actual experience of actual, concrete examples of the past 10 years? That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in the Reclamation Service; yes, sir. Now, as I say, that applies only to certain classes of work. It does not apply to all. We like to have contractors that work alongside of our men, that will set them a pace, for one thing, and to keep tab and be able to answer just such questions as you have asked. Those questions are frequently asked and it is very important that we should keep that kind of a hold on the work, and we do that, and where the work is straightaway work it can be done better by contractors, and should be done by contract. Where the work involves a great deal of uncertainty, it is dangerous to contract, for two reasons. First, if the contractor is very conservative, he will bid high to cover all contingencies, and we will pay too much by contract; or if he doesn't do that, and these contingencies happen, he will go broke and you will have the work coming back onto the Government and there will be a lot of extra expense attached to it. Every failing contractor is a great menace and loss to the Government—not only to the contractor but to the Government.

Mr. RAKER. Under this bill you could not contract any, could you?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. How?

Mr. DAVIS. Just as we do now.

Mr. RAKER. That is the point exactly. Unless you violate that one provision that says that the work shall be given to soldiers, how can you do it?

Mr. DAVIS. We can make that specification in the contract.

Mr. RAKER. That the contractor should employ soldiers?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; give preference to soldiers.

Mr. JOHNSON. It says, so far as it is possible to utilize.

Mr. RAKER. That is just what I was getting at. Then in advance you contract it and you then eliminate the soldier, because the contractor could employ whom he pleased. Otherwise you make the soldier a semi-peon of the contractor.

Mr. DAVIS. The contractors will have to pay the market price for labor, and if he is required to give preference to soldiers, that will tend to keep other laborers away, and if anything has a slight tendency to possibly increase the price—but any restriction, of course, increases the price. But the law requires that preference shall be given to the soldier, that he shall be utilized if possible, and we can put that requirement in the specification.

Mr. ELSTON. One feature of that, Mr. Davis, is that that would check any wastefulness or extravagance on the part of the contractors. If there is a body of men working for him and working about him all the time in the community that is directly interested in the success of the project, and therefore there will be agitation at once if there is any obvious wastefulness, just as you instanced here with regard to the instance down there in New Mexico, where the people complained about the difference in price between contract and Government work.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; and they want the Government work, and that reminds me of a statement made by a member of the committee one day, in entire good humor, and I have no doubt in good faith, regarding an occurrence which he said he had known of, of men in the Reclamation Service playing tennis in office hours. Possibly, that occurred. I don't deny it; I don't know the case; maybe he does know. I have heard such a charge with reference to the Reclamation Service twice in the 17 years that it has been running, and it happens that they were both in States represented on this committee. One was in South Dakota, where they made a similar claim, not that they were playing tennis but that the men did not work full hours, and in tracing that down I found that there was only one case that this man could specify, and we found by following it down that that was a case where a survey party had finished its work and was, in fact, driving back to camp in the middle of the afternoon because it had finished its work. Now, probably this man didn't know that. He met them in the road and knew the men and saw that they were quitting work and going back to camp, and he jumped at the conclusion that they ought not to have done it. The fact was that they probably, as most of those field surveyors do, worked several hours in the evening, working up their notes, but whether or not that was the case, that was the basis of that charge.

The other charge was made on the Minadoka project, where a man claimed that some loafing of that kind had been done on the job, and when I brought him down to it, he knew of only one individual, and I think of only one case where he could actually specify, and I asked him this: "When you found that out, did you inform the project manager about it and ask that it be corrected?" He said: "No, I didn't tell anybody about it. I didn't want to be butting in on anything that wasn't any of my business." I said: "Did you tell me?" "No," he did not. Then I said: "Aren't you more to blame about that than I am? I promise you this, that if a case of that kind comes to my attention, I will, so far as my power goes, correct it. And hereafter if you see anything of that kind going on, you tell somebody who can correct it, or else take the blame yourself." He agreed.

Now if this information had been given to the proper party, and there really had been an abuse, it would have been corrected. I

don't claim that the men in the Reclamation Service are perfect or anything of that kind, but I do claim that we use every effort to approximate perfection as far as we possibly can, and that is something, that so far as I am concerned, will be applied to the carrying out of this legislation.

There have been a number of references in this committee—and it is a very common reference everywhere—that everything under Government supervision or Government operation has to be extravagant and inefficient; and that is true only to the extent that it is unavoidable in other things. If you try to organize an army of 4,000,000 men in a year or two, it is going to be extravagant, because that can not be done quickly and economically at the same time. It can not be done by anybody, and a contractor or anybody else would have to waste money in building up an organization of men that he didn't know, that he didn't know where to place them until he tried them, and all that kind of thing; and that is why I asked him, when the chairman put the question to me, not to appropriate more than \$75,000,000 the first year. We have got a big organization, but compared with this, it is a small one, a nucleus from which we can build, and we will save a large amount of time and a large amount of efficiency, but we can't spend ten times or five times that amount of money in that same time with the same efficiency. An organization in order to be efficient has got to be a growth; it has got to be under a competent man; but the most competent and the smartest man in the world can't see what a man's qualifications are by looking at him. He has got to know him. There is another reason for giving preference to the men that work on these projects. We want our settlers to succeed, and if four or five apply for the same homestead, we want to have the discretion by which we can use our common sense and judgment and acquaintance with them to pick out the man that is most likely to succeed, because it is no kindness to the man who is going to fail to put him on one of these homesteads, and it is not just to the Government that we should do so, and where there is a choice between men applying for the same thing, it ought to be exercised with the utmost discretion and care, and power to do that is a very important one in this bill. And if this work or any other work that is carried on by the Government is carried on successfully, the organization must not be unduly rushed, as the organization of the Army necessarily had to be under the circumstances—I am not blaming anybody for that—but except under such unusual circumstances, there is no reason why work can not be done by the Government just as cheaply, or more so, than it can by anybody else. If it is not, it is somebody's fault. It may be mine; it may be somebody else's, but there isn't anything inherent in it that makes it many more expensive.

Mr. MAYS. Isn't there a necessity for some haste here if you are going to absorb these soldiers before they get established in some other lines of industry?

Mr. DAVIS. There is a necessity for some haste, but not undue haste, that would induce a large amount of waste. If you had asked that question six months ago, I probably would have answered it in the affirmative, because then we expected a great glut in the labor market, but that doesn't exist. There isn't much of that. There is

likely to be a little, as another million men come home and more people are thrown out of employment by the Government and munition factories that are not yet thrown out, and after the farming season is past. All of those things will come pretty close together. We are going to get a lot of people back here in time to take care of the harvest probably, but there is bound to be a more redundant labor supply under similar circumstances in the fall and winter than there is in the harvest season.

There always is, and that is in this case going to be coincident with more people being brought back from across the water, probably. But in any event, there will not be more, in my opinion—my judgment is not any better, perhaps, than yours on that—but I don't think we are going to have that pressure to give men jobs. The appropriation system I have mentioned will take care of a large number and will have a tendency to steady the labor market, and other public enterprises ought to be started probably if anything of that kind does occur. But by keeping this thing in conservative lines so that it can be handled efficiently and above reproach, we establish something that is going to be an immense benefit to this country in the future, and I very strongly urge that if the infiltration method of settlement, or an unduly large appropriation, or anything else that is designed to meet the needs of the service is deemed necessary by Congress it be separated from a proposition like this which should be kept solvent, and by introducing an element of insolvency into it you permeate the whole mass and may spoil it all. I simply hold that out as a suggestion that you do not combine the two.

Mr. FERRIS. Right there, Mr. Davis, what is to become of the soldiers in a given State where no project at all is established, and where none can be established from the nature of the land and the nature of the holdings, the nature of the farms, etc.? What is to be done with the soldiers in that State? Is their ownly alternative to move away to some other State? What is the answer to that?

Mr. DAVIS. The answer I would give to that is that he can obtain employment unless there is a glut in the labor market in such industry as he desires to follow. And of course if he desires to go to farming on a Government project he would have to go to a State where there is one.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, that introduces an element of unfairness into the proposition, that a man in one State where there is no project must catch as catch can, while in another State he may avail himself of the local conditions.

Mr. MAYS. It might be just as much a hardship often for a man to go from one county to another in the same State.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, I don't think so.

Mr. ELSTON. You can apply that to a big State like Texas or California. That would apply absolutely if a man had to go from one end of California to the other. He would just as soon go over to Nevada from Judge Raker's country, or rather than he would to go down to southern California.

Mr. FERRIS. But all the States are not as long as California.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you just allow me to make a suggestion there? I don't want to argue this matter out, but when the homestead act was up for consideration in Congress that same argument was made.

They said: "Here, a man will have to go from the State of New York out to the State of Indiana, or Iowa, in order to get the benefit of that act. Now, why not instead of letting him go there and take 160 acres of land, give him \$160 and let him start in business?"

I don't want to argue the matter, but that same suggestion was made then.

Mr. FERRIS. I recognize that is a partial answer to it, but not in toto. Let me ask the director another question. In the reclamation act of 1902 it carried a provision which provided that the money should be expended equitably among the States, and provided that it should be distributed among them according to the receipts from public lands. That, of course, was later repealed. Now, what would you say to an appropriation in this bill, which would provide that on this Government expenditure, and this Government establishment of projects, that it should be prorated among the States according to the soldier population of a given State, so that each State would have a chance?

Mr. DAVIS. My impression is that that would be unwise.

Mr. FERRIS. Why?

Mr. DAVIS. Because it substitutes a principle that is antagonistic to the principle of the merits of the project.

Mr. FERRIS. What do you mean by that?

Mr. DAVIS. I mean the financial and physical merits of the projects themselves. For example, there are many perfectly legitimate, straight, economic arguments, the character of the land, its location and proximity to markets, and various things of that kind, and the prices of the land is a very important element; and to throw something in there that absolutely ignores those things and compels you to override those things is one of the elements of failure.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, that seems to me to be a partial answer to the economic side of it, but that seems to me to be totally wanting in any answer at all as to doing fairness to all these soldiers. What is your answer to that?

Mr. DAVIS. The answer I have to that is that I have certainly no objection to any such legislation as Congress desires that will accomplish the results you mention, but don't tie it up with a proposition that ought to be kept solvent.

Mr. FERRIS. But there will be many who will be unwilling to let you legislate for part of them without legislating for all of them. That brings you back to the point of making it entirely legislative while you are at it, doesn't it?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, it does; but it should be put through as a separate measure. What I am trying to get at is this: If something that I believe is not going to be solvent is carried out by Congress, I want Congress and not I to take the responsibility. That is all.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, it is Congress that is responsible anyway.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Davis, I would like to ask you another question. Referring to the question of solvency, I would like to ask the director this question. We will take the case of the young man who has been raised on a farm, born on a farm, and has agricultural experience, the kind of experience that is valuable, and he might go to the city—we are talking about congestion—and he could pay 50 per cent on a small investment to get him a little home. He would like to do it there, and he knows all about the environment and the

circumstances, and he has what you have designated as a great requisite, ambition, and the purpose to win. Now, if he is loaned by this Government 50 per cent of his project—a small project—on the pure question of solvency, isn't the Government mighty well safeguarded in that case?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly. I am not criticizing any such opportunity at all, but what I have referred to is the provisions of this bill which loans him up to pretty nearly 90 per cent of all of his property.

Mr. WHITE. I want you to thoroughly understand my proposition. My proposition is not to loan him so much money, but he wants to go into business and he sees an opportunity.

Mr. DAVIS. The Federal Farm Loan Board can take care of that kind of a case, excepting that they charge a little higher rate of interest, and the Government might take care of that. I think, as I said before in answer to one of your other questions, such a proposition could be better handled by the Federal Farm Loan Board which already has the machinery for doing it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Davis, get him back now to the question of giving the young man or the soldier, employment—and I read that from the circular—how long would it be if this law was enacted, say, within the next month, and you started to carry out the provisions of it—how long would it be before homes would be ready for these boys to file on and commence to crop the farms, get a crop on the farm, in your judgment?

Mr. DAVIS. That would be a pretty wild guess for me to answer that question. I think we could probably have some ready within a year, and certainly we could have some within two years.

Mr. RAKER. Now, how many acres are there on the reclamation projects, all of them, approximately—that is, Government land, at the present time—present reclamation projects?

Mr. DAVIS. That is not Government land.

Mr. RAKER. That is Government land at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. Very little of it. You mean that water is ready for or not.

Mr. RAKER. No; that water is not ready for use. Take all the lands on the reclamation projects now, how much land is there that is not under cultivation for want of water, that could be made into homes?

Mr. DAVIS. About a million acres.

Mr. RAKER. If a sufficient amount of money were appropriated, so that you could go to work immediately, and put on from 100,000 to 500,000 soldiers, how long would it be before these projects would be completed and the water placed upon the lands, and then they be made into homes?

Mr. DAVIS. You mean under an appropriation sufficient to complete them?

Mr. RAKER. An appropriation sufficient within the next two weeks now.

Mr. DAVIS. The completion of those projects and the preparation for settlers contemplated in this bill on all existing projects I think would take something like four years. Individual structures would take that long to build, very nearly.

Mr. RAKER. If you had from 100,000 to 500,000 men to put on those immediately?

Mr. DAVIS. We would employ what we could. Of course, you can only employ a limited number on any given structure and structural requirements. I took five years to build the Arrowrock Dam, and it could not have been built much quicker if you had had 40,000 men.

Mr. RAKER. As a matter of fact, then, if a larger appropriation was made, a sufficient amount to complete them, they are so located and so situated that it would be from one to three or four years before the land could be put under cultivation?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. The quickest results would be obtained in the Eastern States.

Mr. RAKER. That is what I wanted to get.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is that so, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Because the work is of a different character. In some of these Eastern States we can do clearing and draining of a small tract and put settlers on in a short time where, a corresponding project in the West would require construction of long canals and large reservoirs, and things of that kind. Engineering works in irrigation are necessarily of a different character from those in the East, which require different kinds of reclamation—that is, it is not necessarily in large tracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further you wish to add, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Only one small matter that I have not had a chance to present as yet.

We have had reference already—implied at least—to the failure of irrigation and to low production, etc.; and we have also referred to the values that attach to land by reason of the existence of projects themselves, and I want to read a letter from the project manager of the Minidoka project, dated June 5—very recent.

The CHAIRMAN. What State is that in?

Mr. DAVIS. In Idaho. It is a report of the State land sale held on the Minidoka project, May 23 and 24, for the Reclamation Record. This project is the one that has been irrigated by the United States. There is a State-owned land in there and they have from time to time allowed people to buy who wanted to buy it, and this cleans up the State land that they had there, and it is mostly culls; it is not of as high a character as the rest of the land, and here is the result of the sale—mind you, this land all has to pay the full price for the water yet after the man buys it.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. In addition to the price mentioned?

Mr. DAVIS. In addition to these prices. [Reading:]

During this sale a total of 35 pieces of project land were sold, aggregating 1,240 acres. Of this there was irrigable 656 acres, of which 262 are under the gravity system and 394 under pumping system.

The total sale price of this land was \$52,244.48, an average of \$42.13 per acre. One 40-acre tract, about 6 miles from Burley, sold for \$190 per acre, and another one for \$165 per acre. Minimum price, \$10 per acre. The high average price is regarded as very significant of conditions on the Minidoka project, as this land represents the tag ends that have been left over after several sales and does not by any means represent the average quality of the lands on the tracts. Every piece offered at the sale was sold.

Now, that is not any land speculator misleading settlers; it is the State, under the operation of the State law, selling lands open to all, advertising them in advance and selling it all in one day.

Mr. VAILE. I had one question that I wanted to ask a little further along this line of cost of Government work. We will probably have to meet the same argument in the House, and, perhaps, the case will be there cited of the high cost of Government work on the various large plants, such as the plant at Nitro, W. Va. I have heard that one in particular criticized. Now, isn't the difference in those cases due to the system of paying the contractor on a percentage of the cost of the work which was done, on account of the necessity of speeding up for the war, and does that apply to work by the Government on a reclamation project?

Mr. DAVIS. No contract that offers a reward for wastefulness and extravagance will ever be approved by me, and I think it is a pernicious practice.

Mr. VAILE. You would not approve of a contract price which would compensate a contractor on a basis of so much of the percentage of cost?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; because that offers a reward for wastefulness.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Davis, may I ask you a question, and that is this—you probably have gone into it, of estimating how long a young man will work on these projects—from one and a half to two years, I believe you intimated—before he could go onto his particular farm. Have you also estimated what it would probably—what he would probably—save save in that time? Because most of these soldiers go onto these projects, I assume, without any money; and what proportion of the amount of money he would save before he would get to working on the farm would he have to invest in that farm, the 5 per cent payment, also in the payment on his house, also in the payment on his live stock, and what condition he would be in when he finally gets things started to do general farming, buying seed, etc.? Have you made any estimates of where the young man would be along that line, and whether we are safe in assuming that he can carry these payments through?

Mr. DAVIS. Your question refers does it not, to how he would get the initial payment?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes; how he would get all these initial payments, and whether he would be safe and whether the Government would be safe, and whether we are properly safeguarding that soldier in this investment that we are proposing for him now to undertake.

Mr. DAVIS. I think certainly we are safeguarding the Government, for under the circumstances that are contemplated in this bill and by the executive office, the margin of safety that the bill provides for the Government, I think, is ample.

Mr. HERSMAN. I think so, too; but do you think it is safe for the soldier?

Mr. DAVIS. From the soldier's end it means that only such soldiers as are energetic and prudent can take advantage of it. If it is class legislation at all, it is class legislation in favor of that class who are energetic and prudent; and if a man can not save enough in a year and a half, he can keep working two years, or three years, or more. This is going to take at least five years to complete, and if there is any physical reason why in four or five years he can not save enough

to make his payments, he will have to be dropped out. But as a rule, that is the length of time that a man ought to have in order for you to become acquainted with his moral character; make him what the bankers call a good, moral risk—and we have been told by the leading bankers in New York that the moral element is five times as important as the financial element.

They give five times the weight to a man's character as an industrious man, knowing his business and wanting to pay his debts, as they give to the financial status back of him. Now, I think that same rule should be applied by the Government, and I think right there is one of the greatest goods that this law will do; it will offer a reward for the virtues that we want to instill in all people, that we all need; and the law that holds up to the man a prize to be attained by industry, by prudence, and by self-denial, and by improving his own abilities, so that he can draw more pay, either on a project or in other work—all of those inducements are inducements in the direction of making those men what we would like to make them, to make them what we all would like to be and all ought to be, and it will have a very strong moral effect. It will be one of the strongest elements. I think, to accomplish what this bill is designed to accomplish, to make men, to put men on these projects who will succeed.

Mr. HERSMAN. I think that is right, but I was wondering if you made any investigations along the line, where the young man has these attributes that we are looking for, how long it would take him by saving to arrive at a position where he was safe to go on this project and operate it himself?

Mr. DAVIS. That would depend on the man.

Mr. HERSMAN. Take the average man.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, the average man would probably take at least two years. I have heard people say that the Secretary said he was going to pay these men \$4 a day. He did not say anything of the kind. He took that as a basis, and probably \$4 a day will be somewhere near the average payment made. Some men would get \$10 a day because they are worth it, and can't be hired for less. We propose to pay the going wages, and we know that wages are high, and that is the reason we figured the basis high, and counting 300 working days for the year, a man can earn about \$1,200 in a year; and if he is the right kind of a man he can save half of that. If he has a family to support, some men could not do that. Those men who are unfortunate in that respect might have some other legislation to look after them. But if a man can't do it in two years, he can do it in three.

Mr. BENHAM. You would, of course, pay the same wages for the same kind of work in all parts of the country?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, that would be a matter of detail policy. I don't think the wages are the same in all parts of the country. Living expenses are not the same in all parts of the country—they probably would not be the same.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You would pay the wages of the locality?

Mr. DAVIS. It is proposed and provided in this bill that a portion of these allotments will be what are called "farm worker allotments," where a man who is not physically, or otherwise equipped to become a farmer, can handle 100 acres, or 80 acres, as the case may be, may take an allotment of 2 or 3 acres near town, and make

the most of his living working at something else, either as a mechanic in the village, or working for the farmers around there—blacksmithing, perhaps, at the crossroads, or working as a farm laborer. Men do prefer to work that way because they know that they couldn't manage a farm. That is actual experience.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in operation now in California.

Mr. DAVIS. That is in operation now in California and Australia and in all European countries, and that allotment will be very much cheaper than the rest, and under this legislation it would not require half the money for him to start with. In California they don't require him to have any money. This law will. He has to have a certain percentage of his improvements. Now, that man would have a cow; he would have a few pigs and a few chickens, and his family could take care of them when he is away. If he has no family, of course, he would not have them, and of course, if he does have them, he would have somebody to take care of them, and this allotment would be big enough to raise a garden and give him some employment when he is out of work in other places, and it would make a home for him, and the farm laborers in that community become home owners and good citizens, and men who frown on all sorts of anarchism, rather than the hobo that so many of them now are, because they don't have constant employment and don't have any home, nor family ties.

Mr. HERSMAN. Just one more question to get my mind clear on one phase of it. What amount of money will this young man need to get the kind of home that you under this bill propose for him, and to pay his initial payments on his land, on his live stock, and on his buildings? How much money would he have to have saved up to accomplish that on what you would say is the average farm?

Mr. DAVIS. From \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. JOHNSON. Wouldn't that, Mr. Director, depend on where he was located? In some sections of the country you would get land at very low prices; in others very high prices.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; there might be a wide margin.

Mr. HERSMAN. Would \$1,000 or \$1,500 provide his seed and assure him a living for a year until his harvest comes in?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; I didn't include that.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to have you give me a general idea what it would be necessary for the young man to have in order for him to be safe over that first year until the harvest?

Mr. DAVIS. That would mean something more. Probably you would have to add \$200 or \$300 to what I said.

Mr. HERSMAN. Provided that man might have a family, a wife and maybe a child, do you think that \$2,000 would make these initial payments and provide for the first year and secure his seed that was necessary for planting for the first year, until his first harvest came in?

Mr. DAVIS. I think so.

Mr. HERSMAN. You think that \$2,000 would be about the average?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I would put that amount to be required—that would be the maximum necessary.

Mr. HERSMAN. \$2,000 would be the minimum?

Mr. DAVIS. That is, the average case would require that much minimum. There are two averages in there; one is the average case

and the other is the average man. Now, many of these men will have several thousand dollars. Many of our settlers are going to have three or four thousand dollars.

Mr. HERSMAN. I was just arriving at something where I could make an estimate of what this man would need in order to carry him over the first year.

Mr. DAVIS. Why, perhaps \$1,800 would be the average needed. That, of course, you will understand, is a very rough estimate.

Mr. HERSMAN. Now, Mr. Davis, the Government wants to take this young man to this farm and the object of this committee, and I think the object of every man who has appeared before this committee has been to protect the soldier in his investment as well as to protect the Government, but the first object is to give the soldier an opportunity. Now, we will say he has saved \$2,000 and he has provided for the first year of his efforts. He has gotten in his crop and he is ready to harvest it. Now, don't you think that the Government should provide that soldier against a possible loss of that first year's crop, which would mean a loss of four years work, which would mean a failure of the Government with that particular man on that particular farm, and don't you think that the Government ought to go one step further and assure that soldier in some way that he has protection, since he has got all his money, \$2,000, invested in his farm, money that he has saved up with care and frugality? Don't you think the Government ought to, in some way, protect the soldier against the loss of all of his investment?

Mr. DAVIS. I think this bill does do so.

Mr. HERSMAN. How does it do it?

Mr. DAVIS. This bill permits the transfer, if he fails and has to quit, by consent of the Secretary of the Interior; and in such case, of course, the Secretary would consent. But I don't see what other protection the Government could properly put around him. It protects him in the value of what he has paid for. Now, there is a value that is higher than the amount that he has paid, because if the work has been economically carried out the coming of the population has added to his value and he would be permitted to sell all these to a new settler, and the Government would be in a position to bring him a new settler and buyer if he were desirous of that, and under meritorious circumstances the Government would consent to the sale.

Mr. HERSMAN. This young man might not desire to sell; he might want to stay there, but under circumstances of failure in crops he might be forced to sell. Do you think it would be at all inconsistent for the Government to carry on an insurance scheme for the first year, like they have insured our soldiers' lives, to provide that soldier proper protection, provided he has paid the ordinary rates that such insurance would cost the Government?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; that would be a very good idea, I think. There is a private institution for crop insurance already.

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes, but the Government carried on life insurance at a very much lower rate.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. And don't you think it would be a good thing to insert in this bill some protection for that soldier, because I think the thing we want to do is to protect that soldier against eventualities that he has no control over.

Mr. DAVIS. I can see no objection to giving the Secretary some authority of that kind in this bill. I rather hesitate to say that because I don't want to be misunderstood as committing the Secretary of the Interior. He may have some objection, I don't know, but I can see none myself, speaking for myself, personally.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Davis, will the boy soldier be required to set aside a certain percentage of his wages or a fund to pay for his home-
stead?

Mr. DAVIS. The bill as now drawn does not require that.

Mr. RAKER. Well, would it be advisable or inadvisable to have such a provision?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it would be inadvisable. Now, I am not saying that with any great emphasis, because I would not see that either was objectionable, but I think that you would, to a certain extent, destroy the incentives that I have tried to describe here, as being one of the advantages of the plan of this bill. If that man hasn't the qualities to make this saving to his own advantage without compulsion, he is not the same caliber as the man who has, and we are not going to be able to provide for them all.

Mr. RAKER. Isn't it a fact, demonstrated by human life, human conditions in America, that the boy who can in a year or two years save from \$500 to \$1,000, needs no help from anybody, and will make a success and can go and buy a farm or a place wherever he wants to, or go into any business he wants to?

Mr. DAVIS. There are some people who can do that.

Mr. RAKER. Now, what percentage of the soldiers—what percentage of those provided for in this bill—would be able to save, or would save, in your judgment, from \$500 to \$1,000 in from one to three years working on these projects?

Mr. DAVIS. I think all of them, excepting those who are unfortunately situated in their family relations, who have a burden of some kind, parents or large family to support out of their wages. I don't say they all would, by any means.

Mr. TAYLOR. Isn't this a good deal true, that if a man can't save anything, working out on a project of this kind at \$4 a day, or something of that kind, he isn't going to make very much of a success farming any place?

Mr. DAVIS. That is exactly what I think.

Mr. TAYLOR. A man has got to be thrifty if he is going to make a success on a farm.

Mr. RAKER. Interpolating a question there, can you tell me how many of the young men to-day, from 21 to 35 average, we will say, from \$100 to \$500 in two years? What percentage of them are doing it to-day, single men, out working for wages? Isn't it a fact that the percentage is almost nil?

Mr. DAVIS. It is small.

Mr. RAKER. Will we change the attitude and the conditions and the character of a man in the way of saving by simply putting him to work on a project?

Mr. MAYS. In the country, I think, there is a very much larger percentage that saves that amount.

Mr. DAVIS. If you give them an incentive, they will. I think the operation of this bill will do that very thing.

Mr. RAKER. I am putting these questions entirely for information.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the operation of the bill will do that very thing.

Mr. WHITE. Those are deep, philosophical questions, Mr. Davis.

Mr. MAYS. There have been several suggestions here that the requirements of this bill, the financial requirements, should be reduced. What do you say as to that?

Mr. DAVIS. I think that it might be safe to reduce them a little. I would not recommend any reduction in it, but the thing that might be safely done, the thing that probably would be equivalent to it, would be to increase the upper limit, what the Government might do in individual cases. I would not think the average should be any higher than the present bill provides, but I do think it would be safe to go a little higher, provided the same proportion of value was required from the soldier.

Mr. RAKER. Could such a thing occur that you let out the work on a project on force contract, with the provision that the contractor must employ soldiers; that they would strike for higher wages and insist upon ten or twelve or fifteen dollars a day, and under his contract and under the Government's arrangement, they would have to be raised and be paid that amount, and after they had worked a year they would say: "This project is costing too much," and they would quit. And as a matter of fact, the cost of the project would be too much and there would not be any chance to sell it for what it cost? Could such a thing occur?

Mr. DAVIS. It is conceivable, but I think there is no danger of such a thing occurring. The wise thing to do would be to suspend work unless other laborers could be obtained at reasonable wages.

The CHAIRMAN. If Mr. Davis is through, I wish to add without his permission or knowledge that when the sundry civil bill was before the House last July, Mr. Sherley, Swager Sherley, was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and there has never been a more careful, conservative, and, perhaps, parsimonious chairman of a committee than Mr. Sherley, and he was not given to throwing bouquets, as we all know who know him. He said this concerning Mr. Davis on the floor of the House: "We have built up a splendid service in the Reclamation Service, and the head of that Service is a man of very level-headed judgment."

I think all of you who have heard Mr. Davis to-day will agree with that statement.

Mr. RAKER. I have known Mr. Davis longer than that, for about 15 years, and I want to corroborate that and to say a good many more things in his favor showing that he is competent and qualified and capable of doing actual work.

The CHAIRMAN. I have a very brief witness, gentlemen, a Maj. Littlejohn, who has just come from the other side. He did not come here as a witness; I happened to meet him this morning, and if it is convenient to the committee I should like to have the major step forward.

This is Maj. Littlejohn, of the Engineers. Major, I wish you would give us your views upon this legislation and what views you have gathered from the men and tell us something about your experience abroad—the length of time you have been over there and the opportunities you have had to discuss this matter with the men.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. K. S. LITTLEJOHN, UNITED STATES ENGINEERS.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. This comes to me entirely as a surprise. I did not expect it at all. I have not come with very much information in the way of statistics or figures; but about the majority, I have only been told that I would get it; I haven't got it yet. I am still called a captain.

I was with the Sixth Engineers, Thirtieth Division, Second Battalion, about 800 to 1,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you on the other side, Major?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. I was over there 10 months. I joined the Sixth Engineers on the 14th of July and left them on the Rhine on the 15th of January. We had in the Second Battalion men from about 42 States, if I remember rightly. Most of them, as you would suspect, are engineers, either because they have had engineering experience or because they like that work, and a great many of them were farmers who called themselves engineers because they could run a tractor, a pump, or something like that. I spoke with some of them—this bill had not come up then, I think, but we got word that there was some such project under consideration over here—and I asked the men of the Second Battalion what they thought of it. They were all very much in favor of it for one or two reasons. One was that they wanted to get back—when they got home they wanted to get some work that was away from a desk. I know a great many of them had become more or less fond of out-of-door life, and a number from the towns, who are now living in towns, talked to me about going West. I coming from Arizona they asked me for that reason, possibly, some questions about the West, and so I imagine that a lot of the men will want to go on farms. Now, there were a good many men that are going back to their job—not so much in the Sixth Engineers as in the One hundred and fifth Engineers, which is a National Guard unit, and those men came from jobs into the service.

Now they are going back to their job. I offered some of them positions in my contract business—told them to apply to me—but I got very few from the One hundred and fifth Engineers, but quite a number from the Sixth, who were men about high-school age, say, 18—16 or 18 to 22 or 23, and who had never had jobs, or if they had they were very short jobs, and those men all wanted—at least a great number of them wanted—to go West. So I think that that would apply a little on the fairness to Eastern States, or, rather, the unfairness to Eastern States and the unfairness to Western States, that I heard discussed here, that the men will go West anyway—they want to go West—and that those who stay will have so much more opportunities of positions in the cities.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your native State, Captain?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. My native State is New Jersey. I have been out West for the last 15 or 20 years, in Mexico and the Western States.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any experience in farming yourself?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes; I have had some experience in Mexico and some in California. When I left Mexico I took a position in the

San Joaquin Light & Power Co. We all came out of Mexico pretty well broke when the revolution started. The Laredo Land Co., near Bakersfield—there were two projects there—that would possibly be affected by this. The Laredo Land Co. has developed and put on lands and owns a patent for its water. I believe we paid \$8 an acre there, and the cost of the land was \$150. Then the Kern County Land Co., right adjoining us, put some land on the market for \$75 an acre, and they just put down a test well, and it seemed to be a better proposition and they sold better than the Laredo Land Co.—at least they have made more sales. We had a lot of people down there, soldiers from the Army, who had not done farming before, and I noticed that there were a great many young people, and the biggest trouble we had was that maybe the first baby or the first sickness that came along was usually about the time the first big payment was due, and very often it was necessary to defer that payment because he didn't have the money. There were a great number of them that had to be put over. I think that was on account of their having expected to somehow or other, without any reason, get water for less than \$8 an acre, which the company had stated. Somebody started the rumor that it would be \$4 an acre, and I think they all believed it in spite of the statement of the company.

Mr. BARBOUR. Was that \$8 a year?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. That was \$8 per acre per year.

Mr. BARBOUR. Just where is that project located?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Twelve miles north of Bakersfield, in the San Joaquin Valley. It was called the Laredo Land Co.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it near that little station of the same name on the Southern Pacific?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes; near the station called Laredo. I am sorry I haven't got any more statistics in the way of the number of men who want to go to work, who want to go out there, but of the men that I asked, the most of them wanted to go—of the men in my command, I mean.

The CHAIRMAN. You had about a thousand, you say?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. I had about a thousand—800 to 1,000.

Mr. FERRIS. Were they pretty conversant with the terms of the bill?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. No, sir; we were not. We got very little information.

Mr. FERRIS. You were just in favor of the general plan?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes, sir; the general plan. I picked it up through one of my wife's letters, I believe, and went right out and told the men about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did they understand that it was somewhat along the line of the reclamation law that had been in operation for 17 years?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. I can't say that either; I know so little about it.

The CHAIRMAN. They understood that they had to pay for the land; that they were not getting it as a gratuity?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes; they understood that. That was what I understood and what I told them. I don't believe those men—of course, they would take anything that was given them, but I think they would be thoroughly satisfied with paying for the land. They are most of them men that want to pay for what they get.

The CHAIRMAN. And they understood that they had to pay for this land?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, as I say, that was what I told them. None of them understood any of it very clearly, but I never thought anything was going to be given them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you explain to the men, Major, or did you understand yourself, the initial payment requirement; the amount of money the soldier had to put in to begin with when he took the farm?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. No, sir; I did not. I have gotten all my information that amounts to anything right here.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you hear the director to-day say that it would cost approximately \$2,000—rather that the initial payment would amount to approximately \$2,000?

The CHAIRMAN. \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. NICHOLS. I believe he increased that to about \$2,000.

Mr. HERSMAN. To provide for the stock and seed, etc.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think yourself with that information—do you think that this affords an opportunity to a majority of the soldiers if they have to make an initial payment of approximately \$2,000?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. I think it does. I listened very attentively to every word of Mr. Davis's talk, and I agree with all of it very much; and I agree, looking at it from the soldier's point of view, if I was going out there to live on it, with what Mr. Davis has said. The only thing, of course, that a soldier will want to know—take, for example, Arizona, where I come from—that is the security of the water; that there is going to be a guarantee of water; or if not, will he be relieved from payment? Now, that is the big question on arid lands. When I was in Mexico it was a question of getting water over the land, of putting water on the land, and I think that would be very fair to the soldier to guarantee that in one way or another. That comes in with the failure of the crop. I suppose that might apply to that also, whether there would be a failure from the act of God or failure of engineering.

Mr. FERRIS. Major, isn't this a pretty large amount to assume that a laborer, a man going to work at day's labor could save in this time? Isn't that a pretty large amount to expect him to save and apply to the purchase of a home?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, it is. There are very few of us—hardly a man, a young man, that has saved \$100; but then he has been living in a community where he has been called upon to spend, to live high or treat, or keep up his end. Now, if he gets out there, I don't think there is anybody who is going to set a pace which will cause them to spend very much money. They are going to spend most of their time at work, and it will be an example for steadiness. Of course, that is only my opinion, but it looks to me as though that would be reasonable.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you think that soldier colonies with no experience, with no one to superintend their activities, would be a success?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Not at all. I believe with Mr. Davis about that. That was the trouble in these projects you have talked about.

Mr. BENHAM. What do you think would be the attitude of the average soldier boy toward this Government overseer?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, that would be all right. I think the average soldier has learned a great deal. He has been studying. He has had lots of time to think, and he is mighty well interested in the United States now, and he is coming back with the idea of getting into things and not just living from hand to mouth any more.

What was that question you asked me?

Mr. BENHAM. I say, what is the attitude of the average returned private soldier toward having a Government overseer over him?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. He will help him out, but he won't stand——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). He has had enough of orders, hasn't he?

Mr. FERRIS. But the point that Mr. Benham was trying to get at, Major, was would this excessive supervision on the part of some Government agent become irksome to the settler?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. No; because he would not have to have it. If you force it on him, yes; but you have got to have a supervisor there that will help the soldier. He is not there to order him around, and that soldier, in my opinion, is nine times out of ten going to hunt that man up and going to get the information from him.

Mr. FERRIS. You think that will be the attitude of the soldier?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. It is not contemplated that this soldier supervisor will regulate the hours of pleasure or throw the soldier in jail if he is absent without leave for half an hour?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. No; he will have to be on the job. He will have to be a father, a big brother to the soldiers.

Mr. TAYLOR. He will have to be the same as the county agent. There aren't any of the farmers in the West that think they are under a slave driver or anything of that kind, because there is a county agent that advises them as to the thousand and one things that the modern, up-to-date, scientific farmer needs information about.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. He isn't a boss, and he isn't a dictator; he is an adviser.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. He is an adviser. Another thing, I don't think they would treat him as a hired employee of theirs either. I think they will be apt to be very anxious to help him as much as possible.

Mr. RAKER. It takes a peculiar kind of a man, of peculiar characteristics and of some age as well as actual practical experience in farming to be a father to these men?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RAKER. You take a young man from 25 to 35, he wouldn't be very much of a father to these boys on a project of that kind, would he?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, it would be pretty rare and hard to get a man of that age. He has got to have been through the mill himself to be able to understand the men and to keep his temper and to help them, which he must do, if, as Mr. Davis says, this thing is going to be a success.

Mr. HERSMAN. I want to ask you this question: Now, assuming that the average young man can earn \$1,200 a year—and that if he is a single man, he is able to save \$700 a year, what would it be possible for a married man with, say, one child, to save, in comparison to the single man?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, a man that is married and has a child, he has got all his work cut out for him.

Mr. HERSMAN. Now, assuming that this man is on the scheme and that he saves his money so that he can make his initial payments.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. He will get that first of all from his salary.

Mr. HERSMAN. Say he got \$1,500 a year.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. He is going to make more money than the single man, on the average.

Mr. HERSMAN. Why?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Because he is going to be a better man, ordinarily. If I have got a single man and a married man, and they are equally capable, the married man is usually the man that makes good a little better than the single man, so far as being on the job all the time and using his head, and I think he will ordinarily. That is the case with the married man having to make good, and I think he will make good a little bit more than the man who is not married.

Mr. HERSMAN. Do you think that at the end of the year he will be able to have saved up more money than the single man?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes; I think he will work much harder than that extra child won't make any difference. Maybe he won't save quite as much but I think he will make enough so he will be safe.

Mr. HERSMAN. Supposing the single man is able to save \$600, which has been intimated here, what could the married man with a wife and one child be able to do?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, I am not able to say, but I would always think—I would almost guarantee that he would come out equally well.

Mr. HERSMAN. Equally well with the single man?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Unless he had a great big family.

Mr. NICHOLS. Major, in what way would you think that the Government is extending more aid to a soldier who has \$2,000 to invest than he could obtain without the assistance of the Government?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, he is independent. He has the opportunity of accepting this or leaving it. This is not forced on him. This is for the man who has nothing.

Mr. NICHOLS. What is the Government doing for the man who has \$2,000 to make this initial payment?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, the man with the \$2,000 has the same opportunity as the man that hasn't got a cent, hasn't he, on this deal? He is \$2,000 ahead, that is all. That is his pass. I don't think that that should apply to this at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, this man must earn the \$2,000 to invest.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. He earn that. That is his investment in the land. Now, in what way is the Government giving him anything more than it is giving any man, any soldier, that has \$2,000 to invest, any more than he could get from private enterprise?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, I don't know that he gets any more than he gets from private enterprise, but he has got this big extra enterprise open to him. He don't have to go down to the city and work by the day for maybe a year or two; he can go right there and go to work.

Mr. NICHOLS. The Director of the Reclamation Service made the statement to-day that so far there is not the apparent shortage in

the labor market that was anticipated, and therefore it is not a great question of providing employment.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, at the same time, whether that is true or not, that doesn't interfere with the fact that this is an opportunity for the man that hasn't got a cent and who can see a proposition ahead of him without any new lights of his own.

Mr. NICHOLS. According to the Director, a man can find employment anywhere now.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Well, if he finds employment, that is all right. I don't think myself that he can, because I think that what the director said at the end was true, that there is going to be a great number of men coming in here at the time when the harvest is ended and who will want to start on construction work. Now, private enterprise is not going to—at least, we are not sure that private enterprise is going to go ahead. That is, you and I are not going to start putting up our buildings, or our dams, or the other things. Here is something that has started, something definite, and that will take care of a great number of men.

Mr. NICHOLS. In your opinion, there will be a great many soldiers who would be glad to avail themselves of this opportunity, this kind of employment?

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you very much for your statement, Captain.

Capt. LITTLEJOHN. I am very glad to have been of any help at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, I would like to have attached to Mr. Davis's testimony the testimony of Dr. Elwood Meade on this matter. We are unable to get him here. This testimony of Dr. Meade was given before the Appropriation Committee of the House at the last session.

Mr. FERRIS. I think it ought to be done. We would like to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then without objection, that will be done.

Without objection we will adjourn now until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

(Whereupon at 1 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, June 12, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Washington, D. C., Thursday, June 12, 1919.

The committee this day met, Hon. N. J. Sinnott (chairman), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will come to order. Mr. Layton, of Delaware, will favor us with a statement before Mr. Davis goes on, as he is in a hurry.

STATEMENT OF HON. CALEB RIDLEY LAYTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF DELAWARE.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. I have nothing specific to offer, but my observations will be necessarily of a general character. I think we are all agreed that we owe some-

thing to the soldier, and the idea has been to find out how we should discharge that obligation. I have made it a point before I came down here, with my own constituent soldiery, and I have made it a point every time I have been on a street car, if I got the opportunity, to speak to a boy in khaki to find out what his idea was.

These seems to be two different general plans. One is a sum of money in cash, another is this land proposition. Of course, I am unhesitatingly against the cash proposition for this reason, that, in my judgment, any sum of money that the Government could afford to tax the country for, whether it was \$500, \$600, or \$1,000, would be lost in six months, in my judgment, to 90 per cent of the recipients of that sum, whatever it might be, and would do no good, but you would be doing a moral and mental harm, in my judgment, to the soldier.

The other proposition also, to my mind, has its disadvantages. I do not believe it will work out in the fullest sense of the conception, for this reason, that 50 per cent of all of the soldiers, no matter what form of service they were in, came from the cities and have no knowledge of country life, and no desire, really, for country life.

Mr. MAYS. Two-thirds of them came from cities.

Mr. LAYTON. I am trying to be moderate, as I always am when I make a statement. Fifty per cent of the balance will go back by choice to their homes, to their father's farm, or to their own land. I am speaking now from the knowledge that I have of the rural district where I live. There will be at least 50 per cent of that 50 per cent that will have land to go back to, homestead land of their own, or their families. That will leave only about 25 per cent, a problematical 25 per cent, to take advantage of this proposition.

On the whole, after looking it over, I have come to the conclusion, however, that this is the most feasible way of meeting a public demand, because the money, if expended, will do a great public good, whether the soldier takes advantage of it or not. It will bring into the production field, so to speak, hundreds of thousands of acres of land which will furnish this country with foodstuffs which we do not seem to have enough of now, with the prices as they are, and help to do that one thing which, in my judgment, lies at the basis of peace among any people, and that is cheap living.

In my judgment, to-day the greatest problem in the country is to break down the prices of the cost of living. It lies at the basis, in my judgment, of all of the unrest in the country, and lies as a fundamental problem in the adjustment between capital and labor. There is no such thing as bringing labor down to a proper condition where the industrialism of this country can live, unless you make living cheaper. As long as you are paying 65 cents for bacon, and paying what you are paying for wheat and everything in proportion, you can not bring labor down and you ought not to bring it down. That is all there is about it.

The farmer, to a certain extent, is opposed to this proposition, because he thinks it is going to be a factor in reducing the cost of his products. Well, that would be so, in my judgment, if all of these hundreds of thousands of acres of land were to be dumped suddenly in the productive field, but a thought will disclose that this will go along, and it will be a long time before all of this land can be brought into competition with land that is already producing; it

will be a long time, and it will come in gradually, and will not disturb, practically, in my judgment, taking into consideration the fecundity of the race, the necessary increase of population—it will not disturb it at all, in my judgment, as he apprehends.

I have only one more thought. This is a little personal—that is personal as far as my representative character is concerned—and that is this: If this bill goes before the Congress, I hope it will be so drawn that the little State that I represent can get more equity than it has gotten before. There was a bill, if I understand it, and you can correct me because you are more au fait than I am in the matter, which provided for good roads recently, divided among the States; is not that true?

Mr. TAYLOR. Two or three years ago.

Mr. LAYTON. Two or three years ago?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAYTON. Well, was there not a bill up before this last session of Congress for the same purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know.

Mr. TILLMAN. In the post office appropriation bill \$200,000,000 was provided for public roads in this last session.

Mr. LAYTON. That is what I am referring to. In that appropriation Delaware was to have \$400,000, which would only build about 10 miles of road, yet Delaware was paying more income taxes, where that money was coming from, by \$100,000 than nine Southern States put together.

The CHAIRMAN. That money had to be matched, Mr. Layton, by State money, as I understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Fifty-fifty.

Mr. LAYTON. Yes; that might be true in a way. We could match it, as far as that is concerned, but what I am trying to get at is that I hope that the bill will be equitable, and if Delaware is paying into the Federal Treasury more money than nine Southern States put together, it ought to have a net return on her swamp-land improvement, because that is what it is going to amount to, gentlemen.

I say to you frankly that this measure can go through, and I am going to help put it through, because it is the best that I have got as an alternative, but really this land will go to the general public, and it will not go to the soldier at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose you have available lands in your State and available projects?

Mr. LAYTON. Yes; they have got 30,000 acres of land right in my county now that is not under cultivation, nothing but swamp land, and it would be a glorious thing under the sun if I could get it drained. I must confess I have not been able to do it by the State of Delaware alone. Our legislature refused this last winter to create a drainage commission for the purpose. I have been fighting for drainage for the last 30 years, I expect; it is a kind of a hobby of mine. With that remark, that I hope the bill will be so drawn as to approximate equity according to the amount of money that the little State of Delaware is contributing toward this great and all other enterprises, I have concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill provides for the construction of a project in each State.

Mr. LAYTON. Yes; in each State.

The CHAIRMAN. In each State one or more projects.

Mr. LAYTON. How is the selection of the projects and the size of the project to be determined?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the governor of your State and a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, will determine. The terms of taking over the project have to be approved by the governor of your State and a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Mr. LAYTON. Well, that will be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BARBOUR. In talking with several Members of the House, I have found that there is a good deal of hostility to this bill, for the reason, as stated by them, that we are attempting to provide for only the farmer soldiers who may return, or the soldiers who want to be farmers, and we are not attempting to provide for the fellow who does not want to be a farmer, and therefore we are not playing fair; that instead of benefiting all the soldiers, we are only benefiting a small percentage, and some of the Members of the House are against it for that reason. I would like to have your opinion on that.

Mr. LAYTON. I stated that, did I not, practically, in my remarks, that 50 per cent would be in the cities and have no predilection whatever for this project, as far as their personal desires are concerned? I think that hits it.

Mr. BARBOUR. What do you think of that proposition? Do you not think that we indirectly benefit the man in the city who does not want to go on a farm?

Mr. LAYTON. Yes; you indirectly benefit him, and I will give another answer to that, and that is this, if you attempt to segregate these two interests, the urban and the agrarian interests, you will leave a good many of those who would naturally have an agrarian interest to be damned by the cash proposition handed out to them and defeat the other. You can not separate them, and you ought not to try. God Almighty does not do it. When He rains on my cabbage patch that needs a nice rain, and rains on my neighbor's hay adjoining, He is not treating us both right, and you can not do it in legislation or anything else.

Mr. SUMMERS. Does not the vocational training that is being given to all disabled soldiers, during which time they are allowed \$60 per month for maintenance over and above their educational advantages, partly answer that question?

Mr. BARBOUR. Possibly, yes.

Mr. LAYTON. If you will excuse me on that, I will just detail a little conversation I had less than an hour ago coming down on the car with a soldier. He was a stranger to me, and I did not know anything about him, but he had a nice, bright, clean face, and I brought the subject up. Unhesitatingly, he said, "I am opposed to the cash proposition. The good, decent soldier does not want any money in that way. It detracts from his patriotism and the glory that he has gotten out of this war." I am in favor of this land proposition, whether it ultimately works out as it is desired, so that the boy goes upon the land. I do not know whether it will do it or not, but that proposition, in my judgment, will safeguard the Government and will not cause ultimately any increase of taxation, because it will come back to the Government sooner or later, and in the meantime the good soldier boy who is sober and industrious will have an op-

portunity to go out on these various sections all over the country and be employed, and in that way you will let things down gradually from a war to a peace basis by taking care of a multitude of soldiers by jobs that they otherwise could not get in industrial life. I just give you that thought.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you.

Mr. LAYTON. I am much obliged to you gentlemen for the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Director Davis is here this morning, and Mr. Taylor desires to ask a few question of Director Davis.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR P. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say, Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the committee, that I apprehended that if this bill comes up for consideration on the floor of the House, there are some of the people who are opposed to the measure, and there are going to be a good many of them, especially some of those that have always been opposed to the Reclamation Service, who are going to hold up as a bugaboo the cost per acre to the Government, or, rather, to the settlers, under those 30 odd reclamation projects, whether it is \$50, \$75, or \$100, and I wanted Mr. Davis to state, not only for the benefit of this committee, but for the benefit of the record and the House, a parallel between the reclamation projects as they have been developed during the last 17 years, and this proposed reclamation project of abandoned lands, or partially abandoned lands, and cut-over lands and swamp lands of the South, the North, and throughout the entire country. It is my rough estimate that probably 90 per cent of all of the cost of the reclamation of the public lands in the arid country is by reason of the necessity of irrigating them, and there is no necessity of that on any of these lands, outside of the West, that we propose to handle in this bill. The great expense that the Reclamation Service has caused to the settlers under our projects in the Western States we are not here complaining about, but if anybody else, who does not have to push the bill is complaining about it, I want to know the difference between what we are undertaking in this bill, so far as the rest of the country is concerned, and what we are undertaking in the West.

If we have had to pay \$100 an acre. or \$75 an acre for the land, it is because that money has gone into tremendous dams, the biggest dams in the world, and gone into canals 100 miles long, and gone into hundreds of laterals, and gone into the buying of water rights, and all sorts of things, the concreting of whole canals for 50 miles, possibly, and I think the Reclamation Service ought to show a parallel between that expense, as compared to that involved in the reclamation of these cut-over lands, for the benefit of this bill when it reaches the House. That has not yet been done, and I think it ought to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. You have stated the cost a little bit too high, I think.

Mr. TAYLOR. Possibly I have; but suppose they say that is the fact? They are going to try to make it appear to the House that the Reclamation Service is probably going to put as big a cost on a piece of land here within 10 miles of Washington, as we have to pay

out in the West, and we do not want to have to combat that with a lot of argument. This committee is not an irrigation committee. Mr. Chairman, you and I and the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Raker have been sitting on the irrigation committee for years and years, but this committee has never had anything to do with irrigation before, and it is not an irrigation committee. This is a public lands committee, and for that reason I feel that this committee, which has never yet had anything under heaven to do with irrigation, ought to start by getting right with the irrigation matter that is coming before them. I feel that is something that ought to go in the record here in a way that we will not have to defend the Reclamation Service on the floor of the House.

Now, with that little preliminary statement, Mr. Davis, I wish you would give a brief description in the record, for the record and for the House, as well as for this committee, as to how the work that the Reclamation Service has heretofore been doing in developing the West for the past 17 years will compare with this reclamation work of swamp lands and cut-over lands and abandoned lands throughout the entire United States, and show wherein the cost will be different and wherein it will be the same, and show wherein your machinery of the Reclamation Service will apply, and give us some estimate as to what, in all probability, will be the expense per acre that these boys will have to pay in 40-year payments at 4 per cent back to the Government for this land. I think that is something we ought to have in the record, so that the House and the country will know something about what we are really figuring on.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just one question, Mr. Taylor. It is not my understanding, from a close reading of the bill, that the boys are to pay for the expense of putting this land under cultivation and the improvement of the land, but to pay as near as practicable the market value of the land, and if it should cost the Government a good deal more than it is really worth, it is not my understanding from a reading of the bill, that the boys will be required to pay the expense of it. In fact, the bill does not say that. It says to pay as near as practicable the reasonable market value of the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. Supposing, Mr. Johnson, that we buy this land for \$6 an acre or \$10 an acre? We are going to get it very cheap in most cases, but supposing it is covered densely with stumps? That land has got to be cleared by removing the stumps, and whether it costs \$6 or \$10 an acre to blow out the stumps and level that ground and put it in shape, my understanding is that that necessary expense on that land, whether it is in clearing it, or whether it is in draining it, is to be added to the original purchase price and to be covered back ultimately into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; as near as practicable the reasonable market value of the land at the time it is sold to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely, but that market value will include the expense of clearing it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is not the general market value, because this land may cost \$40 to put into cultivation. The general market value of that land might be \$80. It is not contemplated that the soldier will have to pay the general market value of the land, but there is some vague language in the bill that ought to be cleared up.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Johnson, you do not mean that he will have to pay the market value of the land, because the market value, we figure, will be four times what it cost. We want to include some reimbursement, but we want the soldier to get the benefit of the increased value that is occasioned by the community, by the settlement, and by the development of the project.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have no disposition to argue it. I just wanted to make that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Davis, I think, has the idea.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill, section 6 provides as follows:

That sale prices shall be fixed with a view of repaying the total cost of each project, and the price fixed for each farm, tract, or lot shall represent as nearly as practicable its relative and comparative selling value.

Mr. JOHNSON. Line 7, section 6, is what I have reference to.

Mr. DAVIS. I read only one sentence, and the sentence, of course, has to be considered as a whole, and it appears to me to be the purpose of this bill to have the total cost of each project repaid, and as to how that cost shall be apportioned among the farms, it shall be done in accordance with the relative value.

Mr. ELSTON. They shall be graded according to quality.

Mr. DAVIS. They shall be graded according to quality and location with reference to the project. That authority is also in the reclamation act. The reclamation act provides for the return of the cost of the projects, and provides that the lands shall be assessed equitably. The language here is a little more specific than in the reclamation act, because the gentleman who drew the bill desired to have it a little plainer, and I think it is very clear, as I understand it. I do not see how there could be any very great difference of opinion on that, especially as explained by Mr. Mondell, who appeared before the committee.

Mr. BARBOUR. Right along the line of your statement and the suggestion of Mr. Taylor, would it be possible to furnish each member of the committee with a copy of the reclamation act?

Mr. DAVIS. Surely.

Mr. BARBOUR. In pamphlet form, so we will not have to dig it out ourselves?

Mr. TAYLOR. If published it will be published in pamphlet form.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is what I referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you have sent to each member of the committee one of those pamphlets?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Go ahead, Mr. Davis, and give us a kind of parallel picture, taking the average form of stump land or of swamp land, as to what will be the difference between the reclamation of that, in cost to the settler, and what it has been to the people in the West.

Mr. DAVIS. In general, the cost of reclamation by other methods than irrigation, and there are many which I have enumerated in former testimony, will be considerably less than most of the reclamation by irrigation. Reclamation by irrigation involves a great deal more expensive works than the other classes, and has been in progress for two generations in this country; and, prior to the passage of the reclamation act, all of the easy, cheap projects had been constructed,

and in doing that private capital had been in the main invested. As the easy projects have been developed and the harder ones tackled, the district system was invoked, and large corporations also, to furnish financial assistance. Very few irrigation investments have been profitable to the investors. They have been very beneficial to the country and to the settlers in most cases, but the heavy expenses of large engineering works, as undertaken by large aggregations of capital, has been such that the interest would usually eat up the profits before the land was completely developed. That was the reason for the passage of the reclamation act, so that the public funds and the public interests could be brought in for the purpose of developing those lands, so that the public benefits that flow from this should be stood by the public in the matter of interest.

Now, interest charges are to be paid under this bill, with the reclamation as carried on. That is one thing we must take into consideration; and, so far as the physical work of reclamation is concerned, there are large opportunities in all of the States that I know of in the eastern part of the country, where irrigation is not required, there are large opportunities that can be carried out much more cheaply than future irrigation and recent irrigation works can be carried out, because they are simple. Not only do new irrigation projects require heavy engineering works in placing water upon the land and in operating those works every year, but in many cases, probably 50 per cent of the area, requires also drainage, and drainage works of an expensive character have been, and are now being, constructed by the Reclamation Service. We have large works of that character going on along the Rio Grande in New Mexico, in Texas, in Idaho, and in various other parts of the country where the rise of the water table caused by irrigation has produced conditions such that drainage works have to be provided, and that is the rule with irrigation throughout the world. I know of no large irrigated valley in the world, that has been irrigated for any length of time, but what has encountered this drainage problem.

Mr. TAYLOR. Those are expenses that are not incident to the cleared land and the swamp land either, are they?

Mr. DAVIS. The swamp land will have to be drained, but the water is already there and the irrigation expense will not be added. A great many of the lands which will be available under this bill will require drainage. Some of them would not be classed as swamp lands, but they should be drained in many cases, and that, as a rule, will be cheaper than irrigation, and even where they have to be both cleared of timber and drained, as a rule, it will be cheaper than irrigation.

Mr. SMITH. Do you mean to say you could clear off stump land cheaper than you could reclaim land by irrigation?

Mr. DAVIS. Some of it.

Mr. SMITH. That certainly is not true except where the timber is very small.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SMITH. It costs up in northern Idaho, for instance, \$100 an acre to take stumps out of the land.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; and in northwestern Washington it costs \$200, \$300, and sometimes \$500 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. You probably would not undertake to clear such land?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. There are in the East and South and North, other than arid lands, plenty of lands that would be very expensive for clearing and draining. Those are not the lands that would be selected for reclamation, of course. But there are large areas, and the opportunities throughout the eastern States are such that we have a chance of selection that is much superior to the present choice of selection of irrigation projects. The problem of clearing is one that grades all the way from \$5 or \$10 up to a sum which is entirely beyond the bounds of feasibility, and it means a careful, judicious selection of the projects, after due examination.

Mr. TAYLOR. In that connection, have we not our disposal at the present time from the War Department a large quantity of T. N. T. that may be used for that purpose?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And is not that enough to be available for this purpose at a very nominal expense?

Mr. DAVIS. It will be available under whatever law it can be transferred. I understand the law provides that the materials and the equipment on hand in the War Department, no longer needed by that department for war purposes, may be transferred, and must be transferred, if needed, to other departments at a reasonable price, and I understand that that is an executive function to determine what is a reasonable price in each individual case.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they not right now turning over a large amount of road equipment and trucks and all sorts of things from that department and shipping them out now to the various States?

Mr. DAVIS. They are offering such equipment to us for sale. I presume it will be as cheap or cheaper than we could buy it in the open market, but the policy, as I understand it now, and the provision of law, as well as an executive order, provides that it shall be transferred at a reasonable price.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do not know what the T. N. T. is going to cost the Reclamation Service?

Mr. DAVIS. No; but it probably can be transferred a little bit cheaper than dynamite; I do not know. It is of about the same value. It is in some respects safer, and in some respects a little harder to handle.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have they not methods now of connecting up stump land, for instance, by using one of these compressed drills and putting in a stick of T. N. T. and connecting it with a wire and blowing up a whole acre or more at one time, and doing it comparatively cheap.

Mr. DAVIS. That can be done. There are many methods of reclaiming stump land. In one place one method will be advisable, and in another place another, and each problem of clearing will have to be considered on its own merits. For example, to illustrate, one scheme in the handling of cut-over lands that I described the other day in Massachusetts, many portions of that, probably 95 per cent of it, can be cleared by a large tractor simply pulling a large, powerful plow, and plowing that brush up. It is bigger than the sagebrush of the West, but not much bigger. Of course, the tops would have to be cut out of the way to get the machinery through,

and some of it has been cleared in that way, with not great success, but I am satisfied that larger and heavier and more powerful machinery would make that method the cheapest in that particular case. We would leave a number of the stumps that would have to be pulled by the stump puller or blown out, but the smaller stumps would be pulled by the tractor by hitching it directly on, and the larger ones it may be advisable to blow up, and still larger ones, making a great deal of expense in excavation, and so we have all grades, from those costing a great deal more than the land will be worth after it is cleared to those that are not much harder to clear than the western sagebrush, which you know can be done for \$3 to \$5 an acre.

MR. TAYLOR. I wish, Mr. Davis, that you would make it as positive as possible in this record that this is not a sectional measure, and will not be looked upon or treated by you, as the head of the Reclamation Service, if you are put in charge, as a sectional matter, but that it is a matter for the entire United States, and to be made readily available for every boy that served in our Army, as far as they want to go.

MR. DAVIS. That is the way I view it, absolutely, and your suggestion is in line with the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma, who I am sorry is not here now, the answer to which I desire somewhat to amplify. He made the suggestion that in States where feasible projects, under the plan outlined in the bill, were not found, it should be provided that loans could be made on individual farms, and my answer was that, of course, was in the discretion of Congress, but if that were to be done, it was so closely in line with the existing machinery and function of the Federal Farm Loan Board that they should have the handling of it and have the authority, so we would not build duplicate organizations for the same purpose. But I want to amplify that to this extent: We have plenty of information to know that there are feasible projects in every State in the Union, provided we have proper and reasonable local cooperation, and that is one reason, Mr. Chairman, why I specifically oppose and object to any legislation restricting the places where this money is to be spent any more than this bill does, which requires that there shall be one or more projects in each State, if feasible projects can be found.

Now, if there is an absolute restriction that we must spend money in a certain State, we will not have that local cooperation, because they will say, "The law requires you to take this up, and you have got to do it anyhow." That was our experience, and it was the misfortune of Oregon that that provision in the reclamation law was incorporated by a Representative from that State, requiring a majority of the funds received in any State to be spent in that State, if feasible projects could be found. Every community has all kinds of people in it, and any project of this kind or any other kind can not be taken up unless it has reasonable local cooperation, and in many cases there is strong local pressure to prevent those who have the power from standing in the way of public development.

An illustration of that is what we had in the Yakima Valley in Washington. There, as you gentlemen know who are acquainted with our work, we have a very fine development, two subprojects of

that Yakima project, and the land is highly developed now, although it was formerly very bad.

MR. HERSMAN. What State is that?

MR. DAVIS. Yakima, in the State of Washington. When we went in there the State, as a State, was in a very cooperative attitude, and so were the public-spirited people. The State passed a law giving the Government exclusive jurisdiction over the waters of that basin, and the right to build reservoirs on the lakes which belonged to the State, but an additional difficulty stood in the way in the matter of water rights. There were in many western valleys a large number of diversions of water, where, in nearly every case, the filing exceeded the amount of water that had been put in use. All these claims were supposed to be more or less valid and would be prior to any filing the Government could make, and, of course, the State could not set aside any legal rights, and it became inadvisable to take up any project there without the cooperation of the interests that made claim to those rights. There was at that time not an adequate law in Washington for the adjudication of those rights, and any way it would have been impossible in this job that we had undertaken to do, and would have greatly delayed and probably defeated the work, as the results of litigation are sometimes almost prohibitive or destructive so that the Secretary of the Interior took the stand that he would not begin development in the Yakima Valley until those rights were settled in some way, and the only possible way of settlement was by common agreement.

The great majority of those claimants, of course, desired the local advantage to be derived, and the advantage to the State, to the West, and to the whole country, and the great majority of them were willing to limit their right to what they had already put to beneficial use, or to the capacity of the ditch, which was usually about the same. We had a careful determination of all those things, and the general consensus of opinion was that that was the reasonable way to settle it, that previous beneficial use was to be a measure of existing rights, and other rights would be waived, so that the Government could know where it stood, and know that additional water developed could be used for the new project.

As I say, the majority of the water users agreed to it, but some did not. We had great difficulty in a number of cases, and they brought tremendous local pressure, of a moral character, of course, against them to be reasonable, and the general consensus of the valley was that this basis upon which nearly all had agreed was a reasonable basis, and finally they all came in voluntarily and signed this agreement, which, on its face, did not bind anybody legally, and for years there was some fear that litigation might be opened, but the works were started, and millions of dollars were expended, and under them the land brought under cultivation, and water rights initiated to the extent that later, when one of these individuals desired to break that covenant and to establish an old claim to water that they had long before that covenant was made, the court ruled that by silence during the construction of these works they had tacitly waived any additional right, and now that agreement stands with the court authority behind it.

That is an illustration of the kind of moral pressure that can be brought to carry out a public work, and is necessary where the

local laws are inadequate. That can be done either by moral pressure of that kind, or it can be done by State legislation, and the only doubt that exists as to the presence of feasible projects in every State in the Union is the doubt of the reasonable price of land. There is an abundance of undeveloped land in every State that we know of. In the State of Illinois, which has been mentioned as one of the doubtful ones, there are 700,000 acres of undeveloped land, classified as woodland in the State of Illinois. We know that there are plenty of places where, if a reasonable price commensurate with the present value of the land can be obtained, we would have an attractive project and could settle thousands of soldiers.

Mr. SMITH. Is that undeveloped land in large tracts or scattered?

Mr. DAVIS. In tracts large enough for colonization.

Mr. SMITH. But all in private ownership?

Mr. DAVIS. All in private ownership, and the price of that land is the only thing in the way. In the West there is a great deal of public land, but where there is not enough public land for a project we have some difficulty there. We have got to acquire this land, and the Government has got to own it in order to make a soldier settlement out of it, but if the communities or States will bring the proper kind of pressure on the owners of the land and have an appraisal somewhere commensurate with the present value of the land, there is no doubt but what I can get a feasible project in every State. That is what the bill contemplates, and what we will try to do.

The bill attempts to safeguard the price by prohibiting purchases except under appraisal approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board and approved by the governor and approved also by the Secretary of the Interior, but that does not necessarily mean that the price is one at which the land could be made a soldier settlement. If they can prove that the land has changed hands at that price, that might settle it and permit the marketing at that price, but that does not necessarily prove that that will be the price that should be paid. The price at which vacant land is held depends upon two things. One is the demand for the land, and the other is the cost of holding it out of use. If it becomes too expensive to hold that land out of use, it becomes cheap.

The colony of New Zealand undertook and did very successfully meet that. I am not suggesting anything experimental. They passed a law providing that any tract of land exceeding a certain size could be purchased by the Government at 10 per cent advance upon the rate at which they had been paying taxes, unless that amount exceeded £250,000 in value, and then they could purchase at a rate not exceeding 5 per cent advance of the rate at which they had been paying taxes. Now, gentlemen, that is perfectly fair. The rate at which a man pays taxes is, according to the law in most of the States, the true value of the land, and to give 10 per cent more than that true value means either that you are paying the fair value of it or that the owner has been reaping an advantage in violation of the land laws. If that kind of an expropriation act were passed by any State in which this doubt arises, showing proper and necessary local cooperation, there is not any doubt in my mind but what we can find

tracts in every State which would be available for this soldier settlement.

Mr. ELSTON. You mean a provision that if the owner asked a higher price than the assessed valuation, that thereupon that shall become the valuation for taxation purposes?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. The land is not taken away from him, but he has that alternative?

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think, Mr. Davis, that a law of that kind would be constitutional—to compel a man to sell if he did not want to sell? The land may be in tracts of such extent that he would not want to sell, and I doubt if you could compel him to sell.

Mr. DAVIS. That is another method, at least, by which you might secure cooperation.

Mr. ELSTON. That does not compel him to sell; it merely puts a valuation on his land, which raises his taxes. If he wants to have the higher valuation, he has to pay taxes accordingly.

Mr. DAVIS. Answering the question of the gentleman from Idaho, it is merely a method of applying the principle of eminent domain which all the States have and all the States apply whenever they want to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me ask you in that connection: Will you not get up against another constitutional proposition, unless you raise everybody's taxes, or the taxes of all who own real estate, to approximately the same level? Most of the courts have decided that you can not assess A's real estate at 50 per cent of its value and assess B's at 25 per cent of its value. You have got to have a uniform assessment plan, by which everybody's taxes will be uniform, before you can enforce anything of that kind in this country.

Mr. DAVIS. This would not be changing any existing requirements of law. The existing requirements of law are that land shall be assessed at its true value anyway.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is not done in this country at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I am speaking only of the provision of law.

Mr. MAYs. You believe the taxing power of the State ought to be used to make men sell their property whether they want to sell or not, or destroy it?

Mr. DAVIS. I think that that is the proper way of handling land—something a man does not make himself—or at least unused land needed for public purposes.

Mr. MAYs. This would apply not only to unused lands, but would apply to a man's farm when he is working it.

Mr. DAVIS. If it were uniformly applied it would not be any hardship to tax land at its true value. It is merely a way of enforcing the present law.

Mr. MAYs. What would you do with the money that you raised by taxes if you increased everybody's taxes so that he would have to sell?

Mr. DAVIS. You would not do that. It would not increase taxes in general, but if it raised the assessment it would lower the rate proportionately.

Mr. MAYs. Then, there would be no hardship whatever, and a man would not have to sell?

Mr. SMITH. I think your idea is all right to compel the beneficial use of land just as you do of the water in irrigated States, but it is just a question of how you can reach it.

Mr. HERSMAN. Has the law any right to condemn property that is held in use for public purposes when the public wants to use it? Take unimproved land that is held in great quantities in some States that we all know about. Can the law enter in and say, "We are going to condemn and put a valuation on this property, and you will have to sell." Can they do that?

Mr. DAVIS. In many localities unused land is assessed far below the price at which it can be bought, while land in use is assessed at nearly its full value. The New Zealand law simply equalizes this and places the correct value on the various tracts.

The CHAIRMAN. That can only be exercised where the use is for public purposes.

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely.

Mr. HERSMAN. Do you mean to say that the laws of Australia are such that a man has to sell at 10 per cent more than the assessed valuation of his land?

Mr. DAVIS. New Zealand.

Mr. HERSMAN. At 10 per cent more than the assessed valuation?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. HERSMAN. If the price he puts on the land is more than 10 per cent over the assessed value, then the land has to be taxed at that rate?

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, the owner fixes his own value for taxation and in doing so he incurs an obligation to sell for 10 per cent more.

Mr. HERSMAN. And that fixes the price for it at the time when the Government takes it?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. If they are willing to sell that land out?

Mr. DAVIS. That is the way I understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is only for Government purposes?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, not to everybody; it is only for public purposes.

Mr. MAYS. Do you have statistics showing the average cost of land per acre under the irrigation projects so far completed?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. About how much does that run?

Mr. DAVIS. It runs, on an average, in the neighborhood of \$60 per acre.

Mr. MAYS. That includes the perpetual water rights.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all it does include, water rights, which is the cost of the construction work which has been done. It usually includes drainage also.

Mr. MAYS. Do you have any record to show what that land is worth at the present time, on an average?

Mr. DAVIS. It varies widely, but I think, in general, on an average it will be nearly double that price. That would not, of course, be a universal rule, but much of it is worth several times the cost of reclamation. I have in mind the Idaho project where the charge is \$30 an acre, \$55 on one side of the river and \$30 on the other, and the average price is over \$50 an acre, and those were raw lands. \$50 an acre was the average price paid.

Mr. MAYS. I had reference to the value of the land after development.

Mr. DAVIS. This has water rights still to be paid for; the water right is in addition to the price mentioned.

Mr. MAYS. What I am trying to get at is whether or not the settler has made a profit out of his investment.

Mr. DAVIS. On the average, yes, sir. That, of course, depends, too, on the individual, as to how profitably or wisely he has constructed his improvements, because his investment has been in his improvements, but so far as the water right is concerned, I think there is practically no exception to the rule that he has made a profit on that worth more than that cost him.

Mr. MAYS. Ranging around an average of 100 per cent?

Mr. DAVIS. I think probably nearly that.

Mr. MAYS. On the cost of his water right?

Mr. DAVIS. I think nearly that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would \$20 an acre be an average?

Mr. DAVIS. Much more. Of course it would be a very wide guess.

Mr. GANDY. Do you happen to have that kind of figures on the South Dakota school-land sale this spring, on that project?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. GANDY. I think that is directly in point to this question. The school lands on the project have not as yet been developed, and the State held its first sale this spring. When the project was built they were raw, dry lands. There never has been anything done on them. The project has been developed around them, and it is my understanding that those lands sold for an average of about \$75 an acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Uncultivated?

Mr. GANDY. Uncultivated, unimproved, raw, and on top of that the purchaser will have to pay the water charge.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. So that the State of South Dakota, as a State, and as an idle-land holder, has profited in the sale price of its land, because before the project was built I doubt if those lands would have brought \$10 an acre.

Mr. DAVIS. And the cost of the water right is \$40 an acre?

Mr. GANDY. The cost of the water right on the State land was \$40 an acre.

Mr. ELSTON. When you estimate that \$60 do you include the initial value of the raw land? How do you arrive at that cost of \$60 an acre to bring that land under cultivation? Do you include anywhere the value of the raw land?

Mr. DAVIS. No. As a rule, I think, with a little exception, the value would be under \$10 an acre. There are a few projects in the eastern arid States, where the dry land has a higher value than that, for farm purposes, perhaps up as high as \$30 an acre, but usually the acre value is under \$10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Davis, can you not give us a little concrete statement as to what are the benefits, if any, of this bill, over and above the present reclamation act? Start, for instance, with some of the provisions of the reclamation law, for instance, that they have to pay for the land in 20 years, and under this bill they have to pay for it in 40 years, and under the reclamation law they do not pay any interest, and under this they have to pay 4 per cent.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can you parallel the distinction, if there is any, and state what are the distinctions between this and the present reclamation law, and what are the beneficial features?

Mr. DAVIS. This law is an improvement over the reclamation law, in my judgment, in several respects. The first is that it applies to the entire country, and you know the benefits of that as well as I. The next is that it places the settler on a going concern, where he can make crops the first year. It puts the land in shape to be cultivated. It assists him in supplying what he needs for the cultivation of the land, in the way of stock, implements, and buildings, so that the man can actually operate that farm and receive results the first year. That, to my mind, more than offsets the charge of interest, because it puts him in shape so that he can begin paying just as quickly as he gets into operation, if he knows how, and he will be instructed how, if he desires or needs instruction.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this instructor to be a taskmaster or boss that is going to control everybody, or be the bugaboo that some seem to think he is?

Mr. DAVIS. Not at all. The idea is to have the cooperation of the agricultural colleges in the selection of men and provision of the instruction, usually, on a large project, by the establishment of local schools or demonstration farms where they will show what can be done and how it can be done, and anybody desiring instruction can come there and get it, and it will be given free and made accessible to everybody. There will not be anything operating to enforce any authority on the part of these instructors, except the indirect pressure that will come when a man wants an extension of his payments, or anything of that kind, or desires some leniency or a further loan.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, if he is one of these fellows who thinks he knows it all and does not need any instruction, he does not have to take it?

Mr. DAVIS. He does not have to take instruction, but he has to make his payments, and that is where the test will come.

Mr. GANDY. If he does make his payments there will be no pressure of any kind at all?

Mr. DAVIS. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. We have now on a project in Oregon an experimental farm at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. There is on many of our projects, carried on, some of them by cooperation of the State, and some by the United States, through the Agricultural Department, and it has been beneficial. They have shown what could be done, and usually have developed different problems, such as raising alfalfa on refractory soils.

The CHAIRMAN. And the farmers seek the advice of the agricultural experts on the demonstration farms?

Mr. DAVIS. The successful ones, especially, do, and there is no effort to force them out. There is no objection to their presence, but they are glad to have them there.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is no more than a county agent that goes to the various counties and acts as an expert adviser to the people that want his advice?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

MR. GANDY. I want to correct the record. Mr. Davis did not get my question, because he made an erroneous answer that I do not want to stand. I said if the man makes his payment there is not any pressure of any kind at all. You understood me to say if he did not.

MR. DAVIS. Yes; I misunderstood you. That is true. There is no kind of pressure at all on the man who makes his payments. If he does not, the pressure is for the collection of the money.

MR. TAYLOR. Go ahead and tell the distinguishing characteristics of this measure and the other.

MR. DAVIS. One of the strong points of this bill is that it authorizes work where the development will be beneficial to existing communities which have now to incur immense railroad hauls to get their supplies. That applies particularly to New England and eastern New York, where intense manufacturing is in progress and where agriculture is in decadence. That country requires reclamation in the same sense, though it is not as difficult as in the western country. It requires clearing usually, sometimes some leveling, sometimes a little drainage, and always the application of some kind of fertilizer, generally lime, sometimes phosphates, and nearly always humus or nitrogen. The eastern lands, while they require that, are not so deficient in nitrogen as the western lands. In all the States that can be done to-day at less expense than has been incurred for the larger irrigation works for the irrigation of land, which will be necessary forever in the future for any large development in irrigation.

THE CHAIRMAN. On the reclamation projects heretofore there has been no wholesale or general buying of material for building and improvement, and that is contemplated in this act.

MR. DAVIS. That is the great contrast between the two. This act provides the farmer with a going concern, and if he is industrious he can take hold of that and make it a success and make his payments from his product there. That is not now true with the western farmer. Under the reclamation act that man takes the water right and the raw land, and he has all the rest to do himself. He has to do whatever clearing is necessary, and in irrigation a great deal of leveling is required, much more than on a nonirrigated farm, and he has to provide his own farm buildings, his own stock, and his own implements and money.

MR. TAYLOR. It takes two or three years before there is enough humus in the soil to produce a crop, does it not?

MR. DAVIS. It takes two or three years more work to put enough humus in the soil to make it pay. In the arid countries the soil has has very little nitrogen in it, and it has to be incorporated by putting in humus and truning them in, and sometimes years are required to bring the land into a productive state by this method.

I do not mean to cite this as a thing that ought to be done, but there are cases, and one that I will cite in the Huntley project in Montana, where a man went there with just enough money to pay his filing fee and get on the ground and have \$35 left. That is all he had. He had to start to work and had to rent teams and had to work out and invoke all the various devices that a man would under those circumstances, and he made a go, and has one of the most successful projects there, a very highly developed 40-acre unit.

This project was referred to by one of the speakers before when he said it was a case where the Government had made a mistake by

the creation of too small a unit. That was in Montana, about the same latitude he was talking about, but he said that in order to make it a success we had to enlarge the unit. I do not know where he got his information, but that is entirely contrary to the facts. The average unit there was 43 acres of irrigable land, and the project has been one of the best successes, and there has been practically no delinquency in payments, and very few applications for any lienency or anything of the kind.

Mr. GANDY. What do they raise there?

Mr. DAVIS. The staple is alfalfa. They raise sugar beets also. There is a beet sugar factory about 20 miles away. But that is not the main product. The main product is the alfalfa, and they raise a good deal of grain.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can you tell the committee approximately how much will be repaid to the Government of the United States by the various reclamation projects throughout the West this year and from now on—cash return to the Federal Treasury? Some intimate that we are not paying back here.

Mr. DAVIS. The amount which will be paid this year is between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want what will be repaid by the settlers back into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. What is the general estimate when the repayment period is passed as to the percentage of repayment of the total amount outlaid by the Government?

Mr. DAVIS. Will you repeat that question?

Mr. ELSTON. Will the Government get 100 per cent back of the money outlaid on these reclamation projects over the period you expect these payments to occur?

Mr. DAVIS. That is a very deep question, and requires some prognostication, of course, but was gone into thoroughly by the board of cost review that Secretary Lane appointed a few years ago to examine all of these projects, and they figured that the return will be in the neighborhood of 90 per cent.

Mr. ELSTON. In the present case that is covered by this bill you expect the return to be greater by reason of the Government getting the interest added to the amount?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; the interest will make it very much greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The return this year will be 10 per cent over your total expended?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Not quite that?

Mr. DAVIS. No; the returns for this year are estimated at \$1,500,000. That is for the next fiscal year beginning the 1st of July.

Mr. ELSTON. In addition to that, of course, this estimated return of 90 per cent of the total investment is due in some measure to the initial payments in the field, and then to the percentage of values by reason of the want of figures such as you put in this act. You are going now on the experience of nearly a generation to perfect this act in order to get around a good many of the difficulties that have been experienced in the reclamation work business?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; that is true. The principal cause of the lack of a 100 per cent collection was the requirement of law that the

project be taken up in every State that had public land. That required a project in North Dakota, and that project has not been a success. It is one that the board of review cut off. It is in a semi-arid region.

Mr. ELSTON. Could that argument be carried back against you, that this bill provides for a project to be established in each State?

Mr. DAVIS. Where feasible.

Mr. SMITH. Was that project in North Dakota taken up against the recommendations of the engineers?

Mr. DAVIS. It certainly was.

Mr. SMITH. It was actually taken up against the recommendations of the engineers?

Mr. DAVIS. I can not speak for others, but it was against mine.

Mr. TAYLOR. You said a few moments ago that the average cost of settlement of land under the reclamation projects throughout the West was about how much per acre?

Mr. DAVIS. The Government reclamation projects?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. About \$60.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you feel that you have sufficient data from which you can give this committee an approximate estimate of what will be the cost to the soldier per acre of the lands outside of the reclamation and irrigation projects of the West? Take the average cut-over land that you would locate and the average swamp land that you would locate, and land that needs draining in part and is abandoned or idle, or used to-day for pasture, etc. What would your estimate will be charged to the soldier? Would it be more than a quarter of that amount?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why?

Mr. DAVIS. One reason is that you are providing improvements and equipment and the services of experts that we do not provide on the reclamation projects. I think I misunderstood that question. I understood you to ask regarding lands that had been opened on which they are now paying. You referred to the projects when completed?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; practically.

Mr. DAVIS. That will be higher.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will that be?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume that will be in the neighborhood of \$75 or \$80.

Mr. ELSTON. You are speaking of the reclamation projects in the West?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Taylor wants to know, exclusive of those, what you estimate will be the total price per acre of projects under the present act we are now considering, as applied to cut-over lands, woodlands, and so on.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand the question perfectly.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like for you to give an approximation. If it costs \$75 or \$80 an acre, which I think it does to the settler, without question—at least it does in Colorado—what would be the cost of the acreage, other than the cost of building barns and things of that kind that they can?

Mr. DAVIS. Simply reclaiming the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; what will that land itself be probably put in to the soldier at?

Mr. SMITH. It will depend on the locality.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am trying to get a general average.

Mr. SMITH. You do not want a general average to apply in some States where the land is going to be very cheap.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a wide difference in the lands in the West. We are just making a kind of estimate. I do not believe it will cost the soldier \$20 an acre, and it cost \$75 or \$80 in the West. What I am trying to get at is some estimate that we can give to the people as to what these soldiers will probably have to pay for this land.

Mr. SMITH. But you would not want to give the average; in a locality where farm values are away down, you would not want to give the average?

The CHAIRMAN. Let Mr. Davis answer it in his own way.

Mr. DAVIS. You mean the average cost of reclamation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. The average cost of reclamation I have already stated.

Mr. TAYLOR. Including the purchase price?

Mr. DAVIS. The cost of reclamation is going through a wide variation, and it is impossible to make any very close estimate of what that will average; but I think we are perfectly safe in saying that it will be less than it has been for reclamation by irrigation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Exclusive of the land?

Mr. DAVIS. Exclusive of the original cost of the land. That original cost of the land is a very uncertain thing, and it widely varies.

Mr. NICHOLS. You do not include the purchase price, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. No; nor did I make any estimate, except I am sure it is lower than the cost of reclamation by irrigation. I do not believe that any closer figures will be available, because we have not made enough investigation.

Mr. SMITH. Is not this true, Mr. Director, that in some localities you are going to drain land and be able to put it on the market for probably \$15 or \$20 an acre?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not believe there will be any case of that kind; I do not know of any.

Mr. TAYLOR. You think it will be more than that?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I am sure of that. There are very few States where we can buy it for less than that. Of course, there are vast areas in some States where we can buy it for less than that, but if you take the average State, it will cost more than that for first-class land, exclusive of any reclamation.

Mr. HERSMAN. From your knowledge of these reclamation projects, and the total cost they may stand the Government, is it not reasonable to suppose that they will increase in value after the soldier settlement is on these different projects as much as the irrigation projects of the West have increased in value, which you have said to be about 100 per cent?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I think that is a conservative estimate.

Mr. HERSMAN. That is a very important thing.

Mr. DAVIS. As a rule; but that depends again on what its first cost is. If we have to buy land at \$75 or \$100 an acre anywhere, which I hope we will not, that puts a very different aspect on it.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to ask you one more question about the irrigation of land in the West. You said the Government reclamation projects had been uniformly successful.

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. Did you not say that?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to have you tell me what proportion of them have been a success.

Mr. DAVIS. I stated that the estimate by the Board of Cost Review, which went into this matter very thoroughly, was that about 90 per cent of the fund would be returned.

Mr. HERSMAN. No; I mean a success as far as the settler was concerned, to make money for him.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, that is about the same answer. An illustration is the North Dakota project, where they refused to use the water. Of course, the settler did not benefit there. In taking up work in a semi-arid region, where people do not have to take the water, and the land is in private ownership, without authority to acquire the land, we can not always succeed with irrigation.

Mr. TAYLOR. A number of years ago they took up a reclamation project down in Kansas.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. They might just as well have taken it up in New York. And they tried to take up one in Oklahoma, and they took up one or two there that they never ought to have taken up.

Mr. DAVIS. We could make an irrigation project pay in the State of New York, if we owned the land, but we do not own the land and have no authority to acquire it.

Mr. HERSMAN. Have the reclamation projects you have passed on been a success, the ones that you have reported on favorably?

Mr. DAVIS. You refer to me personally.

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes, sir; you, as the head of the Reclamation Service.

Mr. DAVIS. I would consider so. There may be a few cases where there is a unit here and there where there might have been a mistake, but the information of the Government is the estimate made by the Board of Cost Review, 90 per cent.

Mr. HERSMAN. In regard to private reclamation projects of the West, can you give me a little estimate of the proportion of those which have been a success, so far as the settler was concerned on those projects making good and increasing the value of the land that he settled on?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know that I could give you any closer estimate that would be of any value. I know that, in general, it has been a success, and I know of a good many places where they have undertaken projects without sufficient water supply, and some things of that kind, but that, of course, is a matter we try to avoid, and usually have avoided.

Mr. HERSMAN. One more question. In regard to phosphates, what portion of the expense in some of these lands of the East would be required to be expended for the purchase of phosphates to reclaim these lands where phosphates were necessary?

Mr. DAVIS. I could not answer that question, as it varies widely. It will not be a large element in the expense, in my judgment, but

we have not made soil surveys. We simply have general information. I could not make an estimate on that.

Mr. HERSMAN. Where do we get our phosphate supply from?

Mr. DAVIS. Phosphates can be had in the Carolinas and Florida, in Idaho and in Wyoming, and I think there are some other beds of less extent, but those are very large, extensive, and valuable.

Mr. NICHOLS. Under the reclamation plan, what would the average price of each project be estimated at? What do you estimate as the average price of each project, under the reclamation plan?

Mr. DAVIS. How much per acre? I did not understand your question. You mean the present value of land?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; I mean what do you estimate to be the average price of one of these farms under the present bill that we are considering?

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, to the soldier?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. About \$5,000.

Mr. NICHOLS. In the reclamation scheme what would be the average price?

Mr. DAVIS. For the water right, you mean?

Mr. NICHOLS. For what?

Mr. DAVIS. For the water right?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

Mr. NICHOLS. Under the reclamation plan a period of 20 years is allowed for payment; under this bill the period is 40 years. Will you please tell me why the difference, why 40 years is allowed instead of 20?

Mr. DAVIS. On account of the requirement of interest repayment. Under the reclamation act no repayment of interest is required on the part of the settler, and this bill requires interest.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it really considered by the department that it will take a soldier 40 years to pay?

Mr. DAVIS. Many of them, doubtless most of them, will pay in a shorter time, but under this bill the Secretary can fix a shorter time.

Mr. NICHOLS. If it takes a soldier 40 years to pay for it would you consider it a success?

Mr. DAVIS. If he did it successfully, I should say so.

Mr. NICHOLS. If he paid for his project in 40 years it would be considered a success?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. The long time is intended as a privilege to the soldier?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes, Mr. Smith; but I am suggesting this: That it is not such a wonderful opportunity if it takes a man 40 years to pay \$5,000.

Mr. SMITH. But he can pay it sooner if he wants to.

Mr. NICHOLS. I know he can pay it sooner, if he can, but the law says 40 years.

Mr. SMITH. He can pay it in less than 40 years if he wants to.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am simply suggesting that it is not such a wonderful thing if it takes that long to pay for it.

Mr. ELSTON. If a soldier goes into an irrigation project and has allotted to him 40 acres of very good land, with an overhead, so far as repayment of interest and principal, of only one-fourth, which is very slight, and with the proper amount of industry, is it not perfectly possible for him to get \$50 per acre, or \$2,000 a year, and to repay the purchase price of that land in 2 or 3 years, if he is a good farmer?

Mr. DAVIS. Very likely. I have known cases where the price could be paid back in one or two years.

Mr. ELSTON. If the projects are selected carefully. The 40-year privilege is for the case of a man with a very large overhead, such as a man with a family, etc., but the goal of every man with any industry is at least a 5-year privilege to pay for the farm and clear up the whole business, and then ask for a release and have the 35 years taken off.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I do not think the average could do it in five years.

Mr. ELSTON. Ten years would about cover the average?

Mr. DAVIS. I think so. I am inclined to think, though, that I or anyone else having this privilege would rather go ahead and improve the farm, bring it to a high state of improvement and comfortable state of living as long as he could carry this debt at 4 per cent, because he can not borrow money from anybody else at that rate.

Mr. NICHOLS. What has been the average term of years it has taken to make payment under the reclamation plan?

Mr. DAVIS. They have no interest payment at all, and I think only 2 per cent or 3 per cent have paid out before the time allowed by law.

Mr. NICHOLS. Twenty years?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; a few have made payment in full.

Mr. ELSTON. Is that because they have not been able to pay out in the specified time, or because they are prudent business men? In other words, would not a man be foolish, when he is only paying 4 per cent on this obligation, to take the earnings of his farm and pay it off when he can put those earnings out and get 8 per cent?

Mr. NICHOLS. Why does the Government extend the length of time?

Mr. DAVIS. To take care of the poor fellow.

Mr. NICHOLS. To take care of the fellow who can not do it, not to take care of the fellow who can employ his money in other ways?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. In the first place, the soldier pays \$2,000 as an initial payment on the project?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; I figure \$1,200 as the average initial payment.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is the initial payment?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. And the 40 years' provision is to take care of the remainder of the \$5,000, or \$3,800?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. He pays so much each year.

Mr. DAVIS. When he gets through these 40 years——

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). He is dead, probably.

Mr. DAVIS. If he has been reasonably wise and prudent, instead of having a \$5,000 farm he may have a \$25,000 farm.

Mr. NICHOLS. It would be a good thing for his children, would it not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; it would be a good thing for his children and for him. I wish I had a \$25,000 farm.

Mr. ELSTON. I wish I could buy a farm with 40 years for repayment.

Mr. MAYS. Comparing this bill with the reclamation act, where we charge no interest, what would you say about it?

Mr. DAVIS. So far as the beneficiary is concerned—the soldier or settler—I think it is better than the reclamation act. That is, for the poor man. Of course, the man with plenty of capital has a great advantage under the reclamation act, but for the average poor man that we are trying to help, I think it is a better proposition, or just as good, to say the least, as the reclamation act. He can get started with at least a small initial outlay and he has a greater chance of succeeding, because he has the wise expenditure of this early investment supervised by experts, and the advice of other experts as to how to secure the money to make his payments, and he has a better chance of getting his money back than under the reclamation act.

Mr. MAYS. You propose to do more under this act than you do under the reclamation act?

Mr. DAVIS. For the very poor man. To a man who has \$5,000, of course, the water right without a long-time interest is a great advantage, but for the man who has no money to make the necessary payments this bill is better.

Mr. MAYS. What has been the average payment that the settler has had to make under the reclamation act?

Mr. DAVIS. The law divides the settler into two classes, one of which makes the settler pay an average initial payment of 5 per cent and the other an average initial payment of 2 per cent, according to whether he has prior rights.

Mr. MAYS. Then, he has to make his improvements himself?

Mr. DAVIS. Absolutely.

Mr. MAYS. You have no provision for any loans to make improvements?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir. If they negotiate any loans with the Government, it must be through the Federal Farm Loan Board, but most of them have their lands tied up under liens and can not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the reclamation law the man had to do his own clearing and his own leveling?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is contemplated under this bill that the land will be cleared for him?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. Of all these settlers that have taken advantage of the reclamation act, what proportion of them had a little money to start with and what was the amount they had to start with?

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, I assume that all of them had a little money to start with; but I suppose you mean something over a hundred dollars?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes; some reasonable amount to go ahead on.

Mr. DAVIS. I can not give you any accurate statistics; but, as a rule, from general knowledge, I would say that at least 90 per cent

of our settlers had several hundred dollars to start with, and some of them had several thousand dollars.

Mr. HERSMAN. On the reclamation projects?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERSMAN. Then, there would be a difference between those men and soldiers that are starting with practically nothing?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, when you speak of the soldier starting with nothing, that means just as he comes back; but, of course, he must have something to make an initial payment.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Davis, why does this arrangement permit a period of 40 years to make payment for the land? What might occur that would take a soldier 40 years to pay for his land?

Mr. DAVIS. There are many misfortunes that the soldier might go through, or he might be burdened with an invalid family or something of that kind; he might himself be sick or might have an unusual loss of stock or agricultural crops. I think in nearly all cases he will carry this debt until he gets his land very highly improved, rather than pay it off with his profits if he has enough to pay it. He would rather build good large buildings, stock up well with high-grade stock, perhaps raise orchards and things that cost a great deal, having his capital furnished by the Government at a 4 per cent rate of interest, which will enable him to have a very much more highly developed farm than he would have if he had paid off his obligation to the Government and then had to borrow money for these improvements at a higher rate of interest. Many of our settlers still have a debt owing the Government which draws practically no interest, or very little interest, and yet they have built up a farm worth \$15,000 or \$20,000. Many a farm is valued at \$300 an acre, with improvements and all; and much of it is in improvements; some of it is in fertilizing and things of that kind. I think a large majority of these men will probably take advantage of the full time allotted because of those reasons.

Mr. NICHOLS. How much do you think, as an average, the soldier could save in a year of employment on the project?

Mr. DAVIS. I made an average guess at \$600 in answer to a question by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you hear the major's statement yesterday regarding married men being able to get along just as cheaply as single men and save just as much money, and perhaps more?

Mr. DAVIS. As I recall it, his statement was that married men, as a rule, were better employees.

Mr. NICHOLS. As I remember, he said the married man would probably save more money, or at least as much money, as a single man.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not agree with that statement exactly; I think there is a great deal in what he said about the married man being more steady and prudent, but I do not think there is enough to offset the increased living expenses as an average.

Mr. NICHOLS. When Mr. Mondell was before the committee he suggested that most of these men would be married men. Is that so in the Reclamation Service?

Mr. DAVIS. I presume the majority are married men. I do not suppose the same rule would apply to the soldiers, because the great bulk of returning soldiers are unmarried.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Mondell suggested that if they were not married they should be married before they go on the project. Supposing they follow his advice and raise a family; do you think that a man raising a family on one of these projects at \$1,200 a year would save \$600 a year?

Mr. DAVIS. Probably not. It might be something less than that.

Mr. SMITH. If he had a cow, and chickens, and hogs he would probably be able to get along on \$50 a month.

Mr. NICHOLS. How much do you think a newly married man raising a family during this period from three to five years could save? How much do you think he will save a month?

Mr. DAVIS. My idea would be that he could save on an average—this is a very rough guess, and a prediction as well—about \$40 a month or \$480 a year. They will not all do that, of course; some will do better; but if they do average that much it will mean that in about three years a man will be able to make the necessary initial payments to get his loan from the Government and begin as a going concern, but not more than that.

Mr. MAYS. There is a question that occurs to me now that goes to the administrative features of the bill. I was talking with a Congressman from Pennsylvania last night and he raised an interesting question. He said, as a legal proposition, how can the Government enter into a contract with a soldier who has not reached the age of 21 years, and I could not answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Anybody can enter into a contract with a minor.

Mr. MAYS. Yes; but the minor can disavow it when he comes of age if he wants to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government permits them to make entries.

Mr. FERRIS. If there is any difficulty about that, I suggest we confer majority on these soldiers for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. We can give the authority to make the contract, and that will control in all the States.

Mr. DAVIS. There will not be many of these soldiers who will be under 21 when they come to take advantage of this act. There were none under 19 when they enlisted, were there?

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I have a nephew who is 20 now and he has just come out of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. If we are authorized to draft a soldier under 21, we are authorized to enter into a contract with him.

Mr. FERRIS. We could confer majority on a very small portion for the purposes of this law.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Davis, have you an estimate of the amortization period after the five years lapse when he will not have to make any installments? Have you made an estimate of how much that yearly amortization payment is?

Mr. DAVIS. That computation has been made. What this means, as I understand, is to require a payment of interest and principal each year, and those payments will be equal through the 40 years.

Mr. ELSTON. There is a five-year period that will be taken off, which will make it 35 years. I think it would be a good idea to have in the record the yearly amount that the soldier would have to pay

as a minimum over the 35-year period. If anybody will supply us with that estimate, it will be very helpful.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES RECLAMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1919.

HON. N. J. SINNOTT,
Chairman House Committee on Public Lands,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: You will recall that at the time of my last appearance I was requested, at the instance of Mr. Elston, to supply a statement regarding the amortization payment that the soldier settler would be called on to make under the plan outlined in H. R. 487. I have had this computation made and am inclosing herewith a small table which you may wish to incorporate in the hearings. The discussion regarding it occurs at the end of my testimony sent herewith.

Very truly, yours,

A. P. DAVIS, *Director.*

Equal annual payments necessary to meet costs of \$4,000, \$5,000, and \$6,000 farm with down payment of 5 per cent and interest of 4 per cent, payable annually, on deferred payments for periods of 20 to 40 years.

Cost of farm.	Cash payment, 5 per cent.	Annual equal installments.				
		20 years.	25 years.	30 years.	35 years.	40 years.
\$4,000	\$200.00	\$279.43	\$243.22	\$219.75	\$203.03	\$191.93
5,000	250.00	349.29	304.03	274.69	253.79	239.91
6,000	300.00	419.15	364.84	329.63	304.55	287.99

EXAMPLE.

In case of a farm costing \$5,000, under the terms of H. R. 487 the settler would make a down payment of \$250 and pay \$239.91 each year for 40 years if that period be used for repayment.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. W. I. Drummond, chairman of the board of governors of the International Farm Congress, of Oklahoma, is here. Mr. Ferris has requested that he be given an opportunity to present his views before the committee.

STATEMENT OF MR. W. I. DRUMMOND, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL FARM CONGRESS, OKLAHOMA.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I represent the International Farm Congress, which now also includes and has incorporated with it the Dry-Farming Congress and the Irrigation Congress. At the last annual session of these combined organizations, held at Kansas City last October, the plan of soldiers' settlements, which we then knew as the Lane plan, was given very thorough consideration. The plan was indorsed, I think unanimously. If there were any objections they were not recorded. The congress was truly representative, I believe I may say, of the actual farmers of not less than a dozen States, principally west of the Mississippi River. I find that I do not have with me the resolution that was adopted at that time, so that I will have to ask you to take my word for it, or I could furnish the resolution later if it is of enough importance.

Mr. FERRIS. Would you mind supplying it to the committee?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I could mail it to you; it will take a few days.

Mr. FERRIS. I wish you would.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Now, as we understand the proposed legislation, the bill of Mr. Mondell very fairly represents the ideas that were indorsed by the delegates to and the members of the International Farm Congress at Kansas City last October. We see nothing in this bill that will endanger the interests of agriculture if it is passed as it now stands. The point that concerns us at this time is what amendments will be made to this bill and what will be the effect of those amendments? We believe that bill is a good one: that no harm can come to anyone from its passage. It may fall short of taking care of all the soldier boys in the way they want to be taken care of, but we can not see how it will prevent additional legislation being enacted to take care of the soldiers who will not be taken care of by this bill.

I claim that the farmers of the United States are as patriotic as any other class of people. They will welcome to their ranks as many of these boys who come back from Europe and who want to reenter business life, as can be received into the vocation of farming without upsetting economic conditions. But if you change this bill so that even 20 per cent of these soldiers, or those who have not been doing farming and have no farm to go back to, are induced to take up farms and given possession of farms which are not now in cultivation, we fear the result. We do not believe it will be fair to the farmer, to the present agricultural interests, nor to the soldiers themselves, because you gentlemen are too familiar with the result of a little overproduction of any commodity not to know what the effect will be.

Almost invariably a large crop of any commodity sells for a less number of dollars than a small crop. Overproduction would not only play havoc with the farmers now in that business, but would also work against the soldiers whom we want to put on the farms. Under this bill we do not believe a sufficient number of farmers will take up this proposition to make it serious in that way; but if, as we have heard, the bill is going to be changed so that you will advance the soldier 100 per cent or make the conditions of these larger projects so attractive that they will all rush there, it will not be fair. If you were to offer any of these soldiers who wanted to take advantage of it a bank on 40 years' time and make it possible for him to go into the banking business, the bankers would protest. If you tried to make bricklayers out of all of them, the bricklayers would protest. So the farmers whom I represent here to-day present this thought: That however this legislation comes through, do not let it be in such a way as to disarrange or overturn the present economic status of the farm.

Mr. SMITH. What percentage of the soldiers do you think could be absorbed in agricultural lands without disturbing the agricultural condition of the country with reference to farm products?

Mr. DRUMMOND. That depends on what percentage you consider. Now, a large number of soldiers came from farms and can go back to farms without any disarrangement; but it is the soldiers who have no place on farms—that is the element that we have to contend with

from an economical standpoint. As we look at it, there are two distinct problems involved: One is an economic problem, the reclamation of waste places, which is something that the country is up against; the other is a patriotic and sentimental proposition involving taking care of the soldiers. The farmers will go the absolute limit in doing their portion toward paying the debt the country owes to the soldiers, but we think it is well to sound a note of caution at this time not to overdo this matter, speaking from the interest of agriculture and from the interest of the soldiers whom we expect to put on farms.

The CHAIRMAN. This measure would only increase the farms $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The population is increasing on a much larger ratio.

Mr. DRUMMOND. You mean the bill as it now stands?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well that bill has the unqualified approval of the International Farm Congress. I am only speaking of the amendments that we hear are going to change it.

Mr. JOHNSON. What are some of those changes?

Mr. DRUMMOND. For instance, requiring no advance payment and furnishing the soldier with 100 per cent money.

Mr. JOHNSON. On land?

Mr. DRUMMOND. On both land and improvements.

Mr. ELSTON. And letting him take a segregated farm?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No; that is not the thought. It is that agriculture can not be expected to absorb all of those men. That is the fundamental thought I wish to record.

Mr. SMITH. The census report shows that the population has increased 20 per cent during 10 years, and agriculture has increased only about 11 per cent during that same period.

Mr. DRUMMOND. We are familiar with all those figures and we are not here to record any protest against this measure as it now stands. We are here to lend our unqualified indorsement to it. The International Farm Congress wants to be read into the record as approving this plan of taking care of the soldiers, and stating as far as it is able to state that agriculture stands ready and willing to absorb a maximum amount of these soldiers and put the boys on the farm.

Now, there is another amendment—I think it was suggested by Mr. Morgan and I believe it is carried in his bill—to take care of some of these soldier boys in urban homes, in homes in town. I do not know whether it is practicable or not, but if that is done then every soldier who is taken care of in that way would be a customer and not a competitor of the man on the farm. I simply bring out that thought.

Here is another point: If you can arrange this measure so as not to force all these boys to go into a prescribed district, but give them an opportunity to replace a tenant somewhere in their own States or in their locality, I think it would be a very fine thing and would have a tendency to solve the tenantry problem. There are other farms that might be used for soldiers. There are big farms that could be cut into smaller ones and take care of several soldiers, and let those soldiers replace a retiring farmer or a tenant.

Mr. FERRIS. Right in our own State, Mr. Drummond, suppose it developed that there was not a feasible project; suppose there was

not an area large enough to place a soldier colony on it. In your opinion, should not this measure be enlarged to the extent that we could make some arrangement to take care of that situation, even through isolated tracts interspersed through other settlements?

Mr. DRUMMOND. If the purpose of this committee is to provide for soldiers, undoubtedly that should be done, and I do not see how any harm could come from it. But, as I say, the International Farm Congress looks at this thing as two distinct problems—the economic problem of taking care of waste places, and the other problem of taking care of the soldier boys—and we think you ought to do a little more in view of the economic problem than you would have done if there had not been one. It seems to me you can merge the two and carry out and build upon a foundation that has been laid on the reclamation service, and in time to come, when we are all gone, this country will find that the foundation laid by the present Reclamation Service will be a safeguard against food shortage.

Mr. FERRIS. The farmers in our State, then, are all in favor of this bill?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not speak for the farmers of Oklahoma particularly, but for the farmers who compose the International Farm Congress, including the Dry-Farming Congress and the Irrigation Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that takes a broader scope.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. I do not believe there is a fair-minded farmer in my State or any other State who will make a protest if he understands this whole matter, and I would be ashamed to represent a farmer who would register a protest against this bill or something along similar lines.

Mr. FERRIS. While I know that your testimony has weight here, and I appreciate what you have said and I know the committee has, your testimony has been along the side of the interest of the farmer, has it not?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, I speak for the farmers. I suppose when a banker appears before your committee he speaks for the bankers. Is not that perfectly natural?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, I speak for the farmers, and when you analyze it, this is what it amounts to—taking care of the soldier. We have 4,000,000 men who have been carrying guns and working in the different branches of the Army and Navy, and we have to absorb them into the different branches of industry. The question is, How can we do it? Do you want to put them all on farms? I do not believe you do.

The CHAIRMAN. If you did it, it would increase farms 50 per cent.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not believe it could be done as easily as it could be worked out on paper, but if you tried it I think enough soldiers would go there to play hob with prices. Bear in mind, however, the anticipation of overproduction has just the same effect on prices as actual overproduction.

Mr. NICHOLS. Was this particular bill, the Mondell bill, submitted to the International Farm Congress?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir. The Mondell bill was not drawn at that time, but I can say this: That I feel safe in saying for the International Farm Congress that the Mondell bill very accurately repre-

sents the ideas that were indorsed by the International Farm Congress, and that this bill as it now stands would have met with the approval of that gathering.

Mr. MAYS. You had the general plan before you?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did the International Farm Congress adopt any resolutions?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Have you a copy of them?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; not with me. I did not come to Washington to appear before this committee. I am here by invitation.

Mr. MAYS. Can you tell what States were represented in that congress?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Every State west of the Mississippi River and some east of the Mississippi River. Some States like Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma were represented more heavily than those farther away. Of course, it naturally resolves itself on a delegate basis. There were 40 from Utah, 35 from Washington, and several hundred from each of the near-by States—Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

Mr. MAYS. Delegates?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. Our work has not stopped with this annual International Farm Congress. It is a permanent institution. It keeps an office open all the year round. It has regular representatives and agents who keep in touch with farmers, and it has a regular publication. I have investigated from 50 to 100 wheat fields in the last week.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has your organization been in existence?

Mr. DRUMMOND. The Irrigation Congress started 25 years ago; the Dry-Farming Congress started in 1906; the International Farm Congress was incorporated under the laws of Colorado in 1915. They have all been brought together under the name of the International Farm Congress and as such have been carrying on this work.

The CHAIRMAN. How many delegates attended your last meeting?

Mr. DRUMMOND. There would have been well over 5,000, but, if you recall, the influenza epidemic was on at that time and we were not permitted to bring all our delegates together. The influenza ban went on at 9 o'clock in the morning on the day of the first meeting, and the health authorities gave us permission to assemble a sufficient number of delegates in the hall to make it representative and go ahead with the business. This resolution was printed and given the widest publicity in our monthly publication and published throughout all the territory that we covered, and, so far as I am able to determine, it met with universal approval, except that they did not want to go too far.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately, how many were present at the last convention?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Over 2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Over 2,000?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I should say 3,000; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you all consider in your meeting the welfare of the returning soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Absolutely, and we are ready to go the limit. Under no circumstances do I want to be recorded as standing here and throwing anything in the way. We are for the soldier to the limit.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Drummond, you say if too many soldiers take advantage of this opportunity, it would be a bad thing for the farmer and also for the soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Certainly; because what is the use of putting a soldier out on a farm under conditions where the price will be so low that he can not pay out?

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree with you there. Then it would necessarily have to be limited?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. To what extent do you estimate it would have to be limited?

Mr. DRUMMOND. That is hard to tell. I think this bill as it stands, unless it is materially changed, is absolutely sound and sane, because it affords an opportunity for a soldier who has anything in him to work out and pull through.

Mr. NICHOLS. You mean that the restrictions in this measure would cause a great many soldiers not to take advantage of it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think the restrictions would deter the man who simply wants to make a speculation of it. My thought is this, that the restrictions in this bill appear to me to have the effect of discouraging the insincere man or the man who is thinking lightly of it, but will give ample opportunity for the fellow who is in earnest and wants to do the pioneering, if pioneering is necessary. It will strengthen the reclamation work and be a good thing all around.

Mr. BENHAM. If your organization was preparing a bill, would you limit this proposed Government aid to these projects?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; I think not. I do not believe that is fair to the States, to the localities near to the soldier. I think where there are soldiers who have opportunities in their own neighborhoods to replace tenants they should be allowed to take advantage of them and be helped to do so.

Mr. SMITH. If you are going to pay the market price for farms, you would have to have a 50 per cent basis for a farm, would you not, or 60 per cent or 70 per cent?

Mr. DRUMMOND. My understanding is that the Government proposes to buy this land for the soldier.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but the soldier must have something to pay down if you are going to buy the farm at the market price.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not think that is to be seriously considered. If a soldier has absolutely nothing and can not get anything, the best thing for him is a job. If he is worthy, he can accumulate something, or, if he has relatives, they can help him. Now, getting away from the reclamation proposition and taking up the individual farm proposition, the relatives of these men can help them, of course, but it might be wise to divide this into two sections and make a provision whereby you could extend 50 per cent, 60 per cent, or 70 per cent help to men who want to buy a farm in their own neighborhood or in their own State. There are undoubtedly a lot of soldiers that you are not going to get on these reclamation projects unless you give them the land and make it so attractive by propaganda that they

will flock to it. Then, the first thing you know you will have a campaign on for free homes.

Mr. NICHOLS. In what way do you think this is an attractive measure to the soldiers?

Mr. DRUMMOND. You mean as it stands now?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DRUMMOND. It is attractive only to a small per cent of them, in my judgment.

Mr. FERRIS. What per cent?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I will fix the per cent. We have, say, 3,500,000 soldiers.

Mr. FERRIS. We have 4,000,000.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, a lot of them will not come back; a lot of them will reenlist.

Mr. NICHOLS. I will say 3,000,000.

Mr. DRUMMOND. If you have 200,000 soldiers who will go on these reclamation projects and work this thing through as business men ought to work it, you will have fully as many as we expect you to have. I will say there are many men in our organization who have given much thought to this matter, and if they thought this bill would result in a million men wanting to get on these projects they would be against it, in the interest of the soldier as well as in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. NICHOLS. Or 500,000?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Do you not think the other bill you suggested would add 500,000?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I know it would add a good many. I know personally of a good many boys who want a farm, but not one on a reclamation project. I also know the other class, restless, vigorous fellows who want to scrap with the wilderness, and this bill will help them.

The CHAIRMAN. You confine your suggestion of segregated farms solely to supplanting tenants?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir. I did not confine it, but I say that is the way it will work out. Now, when you supplant a tenant or a farmer going out of business, you do not upset the economic balance. That kind of man will have some money or some relatives who will furnish him with money. My suggestion is that when a man is willing to go on these projects and wrestle with the conditions he finds there, you ought to go the limit to help him out. But do not stop there. Give a little help to these other fellows who want to replace a tenant or replace an old farmer who wants to go out of business. Then a lot of them will want to go into different trades in town, and if the primary thought you have in mind is to take care of them, you can very easily provide homes in town. I see no reason why a project could not be cut out of 40 acres at Indianapolis or Kalamazoo or anywhere else. You have got a cinch on the financial value of the land because the value will increase and you can never lose.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is just the point. The reclamation feature is incidental. The title of this bill is "To provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval

forces through the reclamation of lands, to be known as the 'national soldier settlement act.'"

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, I apologize to the committee if I have gotten off the subject.

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, no; I am glad to hear what you say. The bill is to provide homes and employment for the soldier on these lands.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. I am speaking only of the soldiers.

Mr. NICHOLS. In what way do you believe this bill provides unusual aid to the soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Unusual aid?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; more opportunity than it would extend to anyone else except the soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, it is confined to soldiers, is it not? If it has any benefit at all it would certainly go to the soldier and no one else.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Nichols wanted you to outline what advantages it would give the soldier over the ordinary citizen, because the ordinary citizen can get a homestead or borrow from the farm-loan bank, and Mr. Nichols wants to know what does it provide in addition to that, especially for the soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, I repeat, if it does anything for anybody it does it for the soldier. If you have a reclamation project from which the ordinary citizen is excluded it certainly gives the soldier an advantage; it furnishes him with an outlet for his energy if he is an upstanding and aggressive fellow, and tens of thousands of them will go out and wrestle with the wilderness, performing a great service to the country and doing a good thing for themselves.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me refresh your memory a moment.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Perhaps I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. It does give them an opportunity to acquire a home for the first job, does it not?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; it seems to me that is the way it goes.

Mr. FERRIS. It does give them an opportunity to acquire a home for the first job, does it not?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; it seems to me that is the way it goes.

Mr. FERRIS. Second, it gives them an opportunity to acquire a home on long tenure—40 years?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I assume the members of the committee are familiar with the bill and realize that it offers a job to the soldier.

Mr. FERRIS. But it does authorize that, does it not?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Sure; but I am not here to interpret the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. And, third, it does authorize the soldier to borrow \$1,200 for improvements?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And \$800 for stock and tools?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; and, so far as I know, no other man has that same privilege.

Mr. FERRIS. And many other citizens do not have that opportunity?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. I think that answers the gentleman's question. I did not quite get it before.

Mr. MAYS. There is not much money available for the settler out there at 4 per cent, is there?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not know of any. I believe this is a very valuable bill for the soldier.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that the initial payment provided in this bill is too large?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Five per cent?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not think that makes much difference. I do not see why a soldier can not pay 5 per cent.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, the total amount would be about \$1,200 average initial payment, according to the Director of the Reclamation Service.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not believe so, gentlemen, if the Secretary of the Interior will protect a man in his selection until he can accumulate the money. I believe it has a bad effect to go too far, whether you are talking to a soldier or not; you can carry the matter of welfare too far, to the detriment of the man himself. But, as I understand this bill, if the Secretary of the Interior will protect the soldier in the selection of his land, he takes a job of work on this project and works there three or four months, which I believe is a wise provision, because in that time he might decide that he does not want to have it any more.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Ferris says it affords an opportunity for employment.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, does it not?

Mr. NICHOLS. The statement made by Mr. Davis was to the effect that there are not as many soldiers out of employment as was expected.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think that is true.

Mr. NICHOLS. So that the soldier is employed anyway?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think that is true.

Mr. NICHOLS. It is not extending any unusual opportunity, then?

Mr. DRUMMOND. It is our understanding of that condition that causes us not to fear the result of this bill. I think this bill will furnish the Reclamation Service all the soldiers that it can use.

Mr. NICHOLS. As a matter of fact, you do not believe there will be more than 200,000 who will want to take up projects?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I would be very much surprised if there were more than 200,000.

Mr. MAYS. You think that is an advantage, however?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. Even if it is only 100,000 it is an advantage.

Mr. FERRIS. If you can furnish homes for 100,000, or 200,000 soldiers you will have made some success?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. If you have reduced areas of unproductiveness to areas of productiveness, you have also made a success?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. You say it might impinge upon the farmers' interest if it is carried too far?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Your thought is that it would be advisable to have the soldiers retain their residence in the several States, so far as may be, with a view to making them conversant with the conditions there?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. I do not believe we should force a sol-

dier to go a thousand miles to relocate if he has his friends nearby, and if there is a tenant farm around there that you can help him buy. I do not think, however, that you should give him 100 per cent in that case; I do not believe he would want it. I would back him up on the basis of second claim, or something like that.

MR. FERRIS. With that in mind, what objection would there be to inserting a proviso in this bill that some equitable arrangement should be made in some of the States so that we would make certain that each of the several States would receive some relief for the soldiers of their respective States?

MR. DRUMMOND. I believe that would be wise, and I believe it would reduce the attack that is bound to be made on this bill, no matter how it is reported out of this committee.

MR. FERRIS. Would not that suggestion be helpful in warding off that very charge?

MR. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; I think so. The International Farm Congress is very anxious to have this bill reported out in some shape so that it can be passed. We do not want it retarded in any way.

MR. NICHOLS. In answer to my question you heard Mr. Davis say that if the soldier paid for his land in 40 years it would be considered a success?

MR. DRUMMOND. Yes, I think so, for this reason: If you gave him 400 years he would take 400 years to pay it out, if he lived that long, because the interest rate is better than he can get elsewhere.

MR. NICHOLS. Mr. Davis said that the 40-year provision is in the bill not to give the man an opportunity to use his money, but for the man who would not be able to pay out in less time. Do you consider that a man who would not be able to pay out in 40 years would be a success?

MR. DRUMMOND. He might be. There would be other conditions that would affect the situation. As I understand it, it is the principle of the weakest link in the chain. Undoubtedly a majority of these people would be able to pay out in 10 years, but you will have those who will not be able to pay out. You can not say to one man, "You pay out in 10 years" and to another man, "You pay out in 20 years," or to another man, "You pay out in 40 years." The wire has got to be set far enough away to enable every man to pay out.

MR. NICHOLS. You do not think that 40 years is too far?

MR. DRUMMOND. No, sir.

MR. FERRIS. You have made investigation and given us your views from the standpoint of the farmer. Have you made any corresponding investigation among the soldiers to determine their desire for this legislation?

MR. DRUMMOND. Not in the same way. My testimony would not be worth any more than anybody else's on that. I only know in a personal way. Of course we have quite a number of inquiries from soldiers.

MR. FERRIS. But not enough testimony to make it valuable?

MR. DRUMMOND. No, sir. It could not be considered representative.

MR. FERRIS. We have in our State 90,000 soldiers, and the bulk of them are just getting back and arriving down there this week. There has been no effort made to take a sounding of their views by any organization in our State to find out what they want, has there?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think not. The only information I know of would be the questionnaire sent out by the department.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it be feasible to call those soldiers together and ascertain what their notions are on this subject, telling them what we are doing here?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not see any harm in it. It might have a good result.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Was this question brought before the convention at St. Louis?

Mr. FERRIS. They indorsed that proposition.

Mr. NICHOLS. They did not indorse the Mondell bill.

Mr. SMITH. No; they indorsed the general proposition.

Mr. BENHAM. They indorsed the general proposition of soldiers' aid.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Drummond represents the International Farm Congress, and his testimony is very enlightening to the committee, and I would like to ask him, if he has not already gone into them, in regard to the questions of separate title, length of time they should hold their land, exemption from debt for a certain length of time, and separate homes. Has he gone into that?

The CHAIRMAN. He went into the question of separate homes.

Mr. RAKER. The question of indorsement goes to the general features of providing a homestead for the returning soldier?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. But as to the question of how they should hold the title, whether or not they should simply have a right to occupy it and use it, whether or not they should live on it, whether or not there should be a preference given to any of the soldiers over the others, as to those who should have homes—you have not discussed that, and you trust the committee to take care of that?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. RAKER. I mean your organization has not spoken upon that subject, has it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; but the matter as it was presented there and as it was argued quite at length, published in our publication, and discussed at other meetings is very thoroughly set forth in the Mondell bill.

Mr. RAKER. You went into all its features?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Oh, yes; very thoroughly. We had both sides. We had Elwood Mead and Mr. King—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I mean you went into the question of prior lien and preference right and community system, separate homesteads, and separate homes?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Those matters were all brought out in the discussion.

Mr. RAKER. Has the organization presented its views on those subjects?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir. Not in detail, but it indorsed the plan as presented, and my mission here is to assure the committee that we are in favor of the proposition.

Mr. RAKER. But they did not indorse any bill?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Oh, no; there was no bill drawn at that time, but the Mondell bill is fairly representative of the things that they did indorse, if I make myself clear.

Mr. RAKER. If that is the case, I would like to analyze a few features of the bill if you have done that.

Mr. DRUMMOND. That has been done.

Mr. RAKER. You are in favor of the general plan of the soldier selling his home?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; we did not go into that, but I do not see why we should not—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). Now, that is why I wanted to be specific as to whether or not your organization had taken up the question of giving the soldier the right to sell his home within a given period or whether the Government should hold the title.

Mr. DRUMMOND. We assumed that the policies of the past would be continued; that the regulations would be reasonable; that in time he could sell it. We do not believe it would be a good idea to let him relinquish it at any time he saw fit.

Mr. RAKER. Every homesteader should have a certain period of time to live on his land before he could make a lien on it or alienate it.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Let us see if this answers your question. I think all of us agree that the soldier should complete his contract and make payment before he is at liberty to transfer it.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, he should be in such shape as to protect the Government?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Absolutely. We do not believe there is any occasion, with the rising value of land, both in the city and in the country, for the Government to lose any money.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the bill the sale, if made within 10 years, would have to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. After the man had complied with the law to the extent that he would have a right to obtain a patent—

Mr. DRUMMOND (interposing). Yes; certainly.

Mr. RAKER. You would not want any board or officer to be a supervisor over him and tell him how he should sell his land, provided the Government got every dollar out of that contract?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Well, if there is too much supervision—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). You would not want any supervision as to the man selling his title if the Government has got all its money out of the project?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; not if the Government protects its interest.

Mr. RAKER. You would also be in favor of legislation providing that the land should not be subject to any debts incurred before patent?

Mr. DRUMMOND. You mean existing judgments?

Mr. RAKER. Any debt contracted before patent should not affect the homestead, the same as in our present homestead law?

Mr. DRUMMOND. That point was never raised because nobody presumed that there would be any difference.

Mr. RAKER. Well, it would be raised, because this bill does not provide for it.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think it ought to be in the legislation.

Mr. RAKER. Then you think that only one tract of land ought to be in the hands of one soldier; that no soldier should own more than one home at any time?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think so. I do not think you should force community interests on those boys.

Mr. RAKER. You do not understand. For instance, one man might have enough money to buy out several other men and have 8 or 10 of these homes.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not think he should be permitted to buy anybody else out until he has completed his arrangements with the Government.

Mr. RAKER. But after he has completed his home and got his patent, do you think there should be any restriction, that he should not own more than one homestead at any time under that project?

Mr. DRUMMOND. That would be a matter for the committee to decide.

Mr. RAKER. What is your organization's view on it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. We have not gone into that.

Mr. RAKER. All right, then. We will not go into that. Would you have all the land cleared, the roads built, houses placed on the premises, outhouses and barns, the fields seeded; or would you just simply have 10 or 15 acres cleared and general road building done, with a little modest house, outbuilding and barn, and then let the soldier improve his place when he went on it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I would give the soldier the utmost latitude for the exercise of his initiative in all cases.

Mr. RAKER. You would not be in favor of a completed farm all cultivated and seeded?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir. I do not believe our boys would need anything like that.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill does not provide for the seeding.

Mr. RAKER. But, Mr. Chairman, this pamphlet does provide for it, and I wanted to see whether or not that was understood by the balance of us.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you understood the bill provided for the seeding of the land.

Mr. RAKER. Well, the questionnaire did.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I am only speaking of the Mondell bill. I am not talking about the questionnaire.

Mr. RAKER. I wanted to know whether or not your organization went on record on the question of homesteads under legislation of this character, whether it should be a completed home all cultivated, all fenced, all improved, so that he could move right upon it, or whether or not it should be just a farm with the general work done in the way of good roads to and from it, part of it cultivated, some fenced, the rest of it raw land, and enough buildings to live in comfort.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Your question is, Did the International Farm Congress consider that question?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; it did not.

Mr. RAKER. All right; that settles that point. You do not know what the organization's opinion would be on that?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think I do.

Mr. RAKER. What would it be?

Mr. DRUMMOND. It would be that a minimum of work should be done by the Government, and a maximum of latitude allowed the soldier for the exercise of his initiative.

Mr. FERRIS. You think the cedar trees and blue grass ought to be left there?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I think if the soldier prefers blue grass or Bermuda grass, Uncle Sam ought not to say he must have some other kind, unless he should want to plant something not suited to the climatic conditions.

Mr. RAKER. You know this questionnaire says it was to be seeded and improved?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I know that.

Mr. RAKER. I want to read it and ask the witness a question; this is all in the record.

Mr. SMITH. If Judge Raker will permit me, we have a gentleman from Idaho, Mr. R. E. Shepherd, of Jerome, who is experienced in colonization work and is general manager of a reclamation project, and I would like to have him heard now; otherwise we can not hear him at all, as he must leave the city tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear him after Judge Raker is through with Mr. Drummond.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would you mind sending to the chairman of the committee a copy of the resolution adopted by your organization?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is already understood. Mr. Ferris brought that out.

Mr. RAKER. Here is what I want to call to your attention, reading from page 34 of the hearings before this committee, an extract from the questionnaire sent out by the Interior Department:

Q. Now, how about getting a home out of this?—A. After you have helped build the dams and canals, or cleared the cut-over land of stumps, or built the ditches to drain the swamp land; after you have helped to erect houses and barns, built fences, constructed roads, and laid out town sites, built creameries, canneries, warehouses, schools, etc.; after you have in fact actually reclaimed the land the Government will allow you to pick out one of these farms planted in crops.

Now, I am very much interested in this legislation and want to do everything I can to aid its final enactment and make it workable; but do you believe that kind of farm would be advantageous to the boys, or one that was just in shape so that he could work it himself?

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, let me clear up a point right there. At the conference in Secretary Lane's office the planting feature was eliminated from one of the original bills that contained it.

Mr. SMITH. It is not in the present bill.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I see nothing about it in the present bill.

Mr. RAKER. Do you understand my question?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. What is your answer to it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I understand the substance of it, but will you please restate it?

Mr. RAKER. You are not in favor of putting the farm in shape and planting it before the boy takes it?

Mr. DRUMMOND. We do not believe it would be necessary to do all those things.

Mr. RAKER. Now, in regard to the preference right, do you believe any distinction should be given to a young man who has been in the service and the law should provide for his taking a home, whether or not he was a farmer or blacksmith, druggist or dentist, before he made his application? Would you treat them all alike if they are healthy, competent young men? Would you give them all equal opportunity to take these homes?

Mr. DRUMMOND. That is a question——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I think he went into that question before you came in, Judge.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I could not answer for the International Farm Congress. I could only give my individual opinion, if you care for that.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I will take that.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I do not see how you can consistently discriminate against anybody. Because a man has not been a farmer does not mean that he will not make a success of farming. If he has carried a gun and performed his duty to his country I would hesitate to shut him out from the benefits of this act. If I were on this committee and had to vote on it, I believe I would hesitate to confine this bill to a man who had had actual experience on a farm.

Mr. MAYS. The bill does not so confine it.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I understand the gentleman's question is not on matters directly in this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, yes; it is in the bill, and I will read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Drummond will be here a week, he suggests, if you want to ask him any further questions.

Mr. RAKER. I will put this question now. This gentleman is here and has given us some enlightenment on these matters and I want to ask a few questions along this line.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Drummond will be here to-morrow. Mr. Smith's witness is here now and it is almost 1 o'clock and he wants to leave to-day.

Mr. MAYS. I move we hear Mr. Smith's witness now and recall Mr. Drummond.

Mr. SMITH. It will oblige Mr. Shepherd if this arrangement may be made.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, certainly; all right, then, I will yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho, Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, Mr. R. E. Shepherd, of Jerome, Idaho, is here and will be pleased to answer questions and probably make a statement.

(Mr. Shepherd's statement will appear hereafter.)

STATEMENT OF MR. W. I. DRUMMOND—Continued.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Drummond, Mr. Raker desires to ask you a few questions.

Mr. RAKER. Are you in favor of excluding a man from the benefits of this proposed legislation, one of these soldiers, because, perchance, he should have a house or lot or home in some place? Would you say to him: "Because you have a little home I will not give you this farm"?

Mr. DRUMMOND. You understand that any answer I would give to that would have to be on my own responsibility; that question has not been before the International Farm Congress. I could only answer it from my own standpoint.

Mr. RAKER. That provision is hitting you right in the face in this bill; your congress has discussed the subject of this bill. I want to know whether or not your congress was in favor of that proposition, or whether it should be thrown open to every soldier who wanted to take advantage of it, regardless of whether he already had a home?

Mr. DRUMMOND. A number of those minor questions were not discussed in detail. It was assumed that that would be taken care of in the right way.

Mr. RAKER. But that is not a minor question. For instance, here is a soldier living on a little ranch and can not make a living on it, and this bill would prevent him from going out and taking a homestead and getting a start. You do not believe that should be in the legislation?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; I do not believe anything should be in the bill which would work injustice to the soldier, and I believe that would be an injustice.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, whether a man has a home or not, no matter what the size of it may be, if you are going to extend this aid to these soldiers who have served in this war, and treat them all alike, you believe that anyone who wants to go on these projects under the rules and regulations that may be adopted should be given a home of his own free choice?

Mr. DRUMMOND. I believe anything else would violate the established policy of the Government. Do we refuse a man a pension because he has got some money? Our people have not discussed that point, but I feel that if they had discussed it they would say the same thing.

Mr. RAKER. You think they all ought to be treated alike?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That is right, is it not?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; that is what I think about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to direct Mr. Drummond's attention to the exact language of the bill just on that point: "That soldiers who are not the owners or proprietors of farms or rural homes shall be eligible as purchasers." The idea of that was to supply a farm to a soldier who did not have a farm or rural home.

Mr. DRUMMOND. I will say this: That no matter how you settle that phase of the question it would not alter the indorsement of the International Farm Congress of this general proposition. I think that explains it.

The CHAIRMAN. You indorse the general proposition, irrespective of little changes in detail one way or the other?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; leaving it to the judgment of the committee to work those things out.

Mr. RAKER. Now, because a man owned a rural home or a farm, you would not exclude him from getting a home under one of these projects, would you?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; I do not believe I would, but I do not think he would want one.

Mr. RAKER. That is not the question. Leave it up to him. Are you in favor of this special legislation?

Mr. DRUMMOND. No, sir; personally I am not.

Mr. RAKER. Would you be in favor of giving a preference to one class of soldiers over another simply because they worked on the project?

Mr. DRUMMOND. We would prefer to leave those matters to the wisdom of this committee. As far as I am concerned, as one member and a representative of the congress, I would prefer not to discuss that. Let the legal talent and brains represented by this committee work it out. We consider that a detail. We consider everything a detail except the measure itself.

Mr. RAKER. You consider everything a detail except the measure itself?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir; such features as you have mentioned.

Mr. RAKER. Do you believe a man should live on his homestead under this proposed legislation?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, we find in there at least seven of the fundamental principles of this bill that have not been discussed by your congress and which you think should be left to this committee?

Mr. DRUMMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That is all; thank you.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned until Saturday, June 14, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, June 14, 1919.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Gentlemen of the committee, we have with us this morning Secretary Baker, who has kindly consented to make a statement concerning the bill and whether or not he approves of the plan or disapproves of it.

Mr. Secretary, will you present your views now?

STATEMENT OF HON. NEWTON D. BAKER, SECRETARY OF WAR.

Secretary BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I feel some embarrassment in coming before you because I have not been able to get any expression of soldier sentiment for your information. Col. Woods, who is responsible for the whole question of finding places for soldiers, is out of the city and immediately on his return I will get from him whatever facts he has acquired in his contact with the soldiers and send it down for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have it.

Secretary BAKER. Col. Woods is in touch, I think, with every agency that is finding places of employment for soldiers and with every group of soldiers seeking places of employment and avenues of occupation, so that it is entirely likely that he has some information supplementary to that which the Secretary of the Interior has

put in his letter to the chairman of the committee. Beyond that I do not know that I can be of any service, except in two particulars.

A copy of this bill was sent to my department, I think, perhaps by the chairman, with the request that certain phrases be examined to see whether they would be interpreted by our law officers as including certain groups of persons. I have sent to the chairman a rather long letter suggesting some modifications of phrase, purely in the interest of clarifying the intention of the bill, and not dealing with the questions of the policy of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That relates to how comprehensive this language is in the first section, I suppose?

Secretary BAKER. Soldiers, sailors, and marines, yes. That letter, Mr. Chairman, ought to be in your hands now. It came down yesterday and your clerk probably has received it. It is the work of the Judge Advocate General and his assistants.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think it has been received yet.

Secretary BAKER. It doubtless will be here to-day, then.

Generally, on the subject of the purposes of the bill, of course, the War Department has a very deep interest in the repatriation of the soldier, and particularly in his opportunity of access to the land if it can be secured for him. I have read over the bill. Farming is a science about which I know very little, but it is of fundamental interest to the country, of course, and if the soldiers can be supplied with opportunities to begin rural life and farming life in an independent way, it is very greatly to be desired and it should be done. So, I would like the record to show that I express the heartiest concurrence in the purposes of the bill, and the only doubt I have about it—and I venture that with very great deference—is as to whether the provisions in the bill are sufficiently elastic in the matter of giving these young soldiers an opportunity to learn how to farm. I am inclined to think that if the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior were somewhat enlarged, so that he could employ competent farmers as general guides and directors and instructors of these projects, that it would be a wholesome thing, because I have just a little fear that some of these young soldiers in their enthusiasm may go out on a project and imagine—as some people imagine that do not know anything about it—that farming is easy. Of course, farming is a science.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the purpose of the Secretary, as I understand the bill, to do just that thing that you say should be done.

Secretary BAKER. I read the bill with that particularly in mind, and it seemed to me that the discretion given him was rather limited, and if by widening his discretion there, competent instructors could be provided, it would, of course, be very desirable.

The committee may be interested to know that in the University at Bonne in France, the American Expeditionary Force University, which is perhaps the most remarkable educational institution in the world anywhere and at any time; a university which was set up in shacks that were built for a hospital and were not occupied as a hospital—the university was set up immediately after the declaration of the armistice and 11,000 students are in attendance at that university. It has 11 colleges, divinity, law, medicine, veterinary surgery, art, painting, drawing, sculpture, music, languages, modern

languages, higher mathematics. I saw a doughboy teaching integral calculus to a group of 15 or 16 men, some of whom were majors and captains, and this private was giving these superior officers lessons in integral calculus. It is a most remarkable educational institution, quite the most remarkable in the world. One of its 11 colleges is a college of agriculture, in which not only ordinary farming is taught, but the adaptations of soil to crops, theories of fertilizing, farm economics, marketing—a very elaborate and intricate course in farming. When I was at Bonne I went to the agricultural college, which is separated from the main body of the university, perhaps six or eight miles, and I found it much the largest of all the colleges in its attendance. So, there is that evidence of interest on the part of soldiers in acquiring a practical and scientific knowledge of farming.

The CHAIRMAN. Do our soldiers attend there?

Secretary BAKER. Yes; they are all our soldiers—11,000 of our soldiers. And I have no doubt whatever that the graduates of the college of agriculture in the American Expeditionary Force University will be very much interested in any plan which will enable them to become farm owners and operators. It is a very large body of men.

I think I can add nothing further, Mr. Chairman, unless the members of the committee wish to ask some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any members of the committee desire to interrogate the Secretary?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Secretary, has there been an effort made to take any expression of any sort from any considerable number of soldiers as to their desires after the war?

Secretary BAKER. Not through the War Department. Mr. Lane has made some such effort, and he has, as I understand it in his reports, received favorable expressions from about 50,000. Those are doubtless stimulated by some kind of a questionnaire.

Mr. FERRIS. I think his testimony is that he sent out 250,000 questionnaires and that 52,000 replies came back.

Secretary BAKER. Col. Woods may have made some such inquiry, Mr. Ferris, but he is out of the city now.

Mr. FERRIS. He handles the demobilization and repatriation features of it in your department?

Secretary BAKER. He handles the entire employment feature. He is in touch with the chambers of commerce and with every agency throughout the country that is interested in getting the soldier back to his job—labor and all.

Mr. FERRIS. Could a hasty sounding of sentiment be made through the different commanding officers, generals, etc., to get at what is in the minds of the soldiers?

Secretary BAKER. It would be very difficult to get an accurate one, because the Army is 67 per cent now demobilized, and those who have disappeared from the Military Establishment and have been discharged, of course, it would be very difficult to get at. It would be very easy to take a division like the Thirty-sixth Division, which is not yet demobilized, and make an inquiry there.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, they are in process of demobilization now?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. They are going down to the demobilization camps now?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I think they passed through New York yesterday, and will be in Texas in the next day or two.

Secretary BAKER. At every demobilization camp there is an office through which the men go, and one of the features of that office is an employment section; and every man who hasn't a job to which he is going and knows about goes to that employment section and states what kind of a job he wants.

Mr. FERRIS. How effective and how successful is that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary BAKER. It is very effective and very successful in most parts of the country. But, of course, it would hardly be fair to judge the desire of the soldier to get land by any inquiry he made there, because he doesn't know of any opportunity to get land. Most of them say: "I would like to work in an automobile factory as a salesman, as a stenographer," or whatever the business is.

Mr. FERRIS. So any of the activities that you are displaying would in no wise complicate or run counter with Secretary Lane's plan.

Secretary BAKER. Not in the least.

Mr. FERRIS. And as to the feasibility of it, and as to any knowledge of what the soldier really wants in connection with the Lane plan, you think Col. Woods would have more information on that?

Secretary BAKER. Col. Woods would have very much better judgment on that than I.

Mr. FERRIS. Would it be practicable even yet—and I ask this question having in mind a lot of testimony we have had here in the last two or three weeks—to gather through the commanding officer, or have the commanding officer explain this bill to the soldiers, this plan, with the view of getting some idea of their position?

Secretary BAKER. It would be entirely feasible in all undemobilized divisions. There are perhaps three or four divisions in the country now that are either being demobilized or are about to be.

Mr. FERRIS. They would be very easily assembled, of course?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Because only recently we met the Thirty-sixth at New York and they were assembled, and it could have been very easily done there. A keen fellow who was in touch with the men could very quickly explain the salient features of this bill and say to them: "Do you want it?" And obtain expressions from them. It could have been done with the Ninetieth when they came back. I met the Ninetieth and they were assembled, and we went in and welcomed them. Of course, we didn't take time to talk to them about this proposition, but I have been thinking, when I heard you were coming up here, as to the feasibility of having some man thoroughly conversant with this thing assemble these men, just on the eve of their stepping out of military life into civil life, and put the salient features of this bill before them and see if it appeals to them.

Secretary BAKER. It would be a very dangerous thing to do, Mr. Ferris, unless it were well done. For instance, if you were to get a group of soldiers together and say: "The Government has in mind the reclaiming of arid or swamp lands, and is willing to employ a lot of you to do the reclamation work and then to locate you on the farms. How many of you want to do that?" The mental picture presented to the mind of the soldier would be the Everglades or some

arid country that he doesn't know about, and he would say: "Oh, that is too far away; too indefinite." But if it was carefully explained that these areas are to be in each State, and the cooperation of the State is to be employed so that a man would not necessarily have to move away substantially from his own native environment, I think you would get very different answers.

Mr. FERRIS. That is the very point, Mr. Secretary. They are getting a great deal of misinformation about it. I have talked to several of them privately myself, and I know that different people, through different avenue, are presenting this thing in as different a light as it could be presented, and telling the soldier, as you suggest, that they are going to put him in some frog pond or sand dune, and that he is going to perish before he can ever get away from it. That the next soldier may figure that he is going to have a beautiful home and a lawn in front and a baby carriage and a hammock in the backyard, and grapevines and trees, and everything else. He has that kind of a picture of it, and my thought was that inasmuch as the President has come out in his message about it to Congress, and inasmuch as Secretary Lane, who has to do with these plans, has displayed a great deal of activity about it; inasmuch as Mr. Mondell, the Republican floor leader, has introduced this bill and we are having hearings on it, I thought that the diversity of knowledge that was being sent out might better be supplied by something real and substantial.

Secretary BAKER. I venture to make this suggestion: Col. Woods, I think, will be back on Monday morning. I will get him to come down and tell you all he knows, and then if it seems to the committee that the question should be addressed by telegraph to the commanders of any divisions which are as yet undemobilized, to get additional information, he will send the message and get the information for you.

Wouldn't it be a wise thing, Mr. Chairman, to put in this bill somewhere—my mind is thinking along as I talk—some sort of provision authorizing cooperation by the Department of Agriculture? They have a system of farm agents, as I understand it, in the Department of Agriculture, by which they send out a large number of agents who go about the country and talk rotation of crops and explain soil conditions to the farmers. It might well be that that would be a ready-made body of instructors and aides that could be used in conjunction with this plan.

Mr. FERRIS. You mean these county agents and field demonstrators of the Department of Agriculture?

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, concerning your suggestion about securing additional information, that recalls to my mind that Maj. or Col. Bashure was before the committee, a demobilizing officer, and he stated that he made inquiries, and out of some seven or eight hundred men, 87 per cent signified their desire for this plan; that 87 per cent out of 800 men signified a desire to take advantage of this plan.

Secretary BAKER. Plainly, that was not the Seventy-ninth Division.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Secretary BAKER. That percentage would vary very much. The Seventy-ninth Division is from New York City, and those boys, of course, all want to get back to the city environment to which they are

accustomed, but if you get a division like the Eighty-ninth, one of those from Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona—that part of the country—doubtless you would find a very large number of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of these men were from Kentucky, as I recall it.

Well, I think the committee would like to have Col. Woods, if we can get him next Monday.

Secretary BAKER. Will you meet on Monday?

The CHAIRMAN. I think very likely the committee will meet Monday morning.

Secretary BAKER. I will ask Col. Woods to put himself in communication with your office, Mr. Chairman, and find out when it will be convenient to hear him.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask you, Mr. Secretary, have you any figures on the proposition of how many of these soldiers actually want anything done for them at all? In other words, how many of them are going back to their old channels of occupation, their old jobs, and how many need a job at all?

Secretary BAKER. I have complete statistics of that. I haven't it with me.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there a large percentage of them that want new jobs, or are most of them drifting back to their old places?

Secretary BAKER. The number who applied for aid in securing employment is relatively small—absolutely large, but relatively small to the total number demobilized. But, of course, Mr. Ferris, what we have is just their initial impulse as they are being demobilized. Those boys think: "Well, when I get back home, somebody will find a job for me," and they don't make any request, but when they get back home and find that jobs are not so plentiful, they begin to apply to chambers of commerce, boards of industry, and things of that sort, or they get a job through the Camp Activities Service, which they don't like, and they drift out of that and become seekers for employment. So the record of the camp would not show the actual number of men who want assistance in this way.

Mr. FERRIS. They sometimes find that the positions they had have been taken up by others, and when they get back the situation is not as rosy as they thought it was.

Secretary BAKER. That is it in some cases, and then, of course, I think we have to recognize that the returning soldier is an entirely different man from the man who went away. He is matured and is very much older than the intervening lapse of time would suggest. He has gotten a lot of education that he didn't have before, and he feels himself fitted for more expert work than he did before, so that they are all seeking a higher type of employment, or for the most part seeking a higher type of employment. It isn't any dissatisfaction with old labor conditions, but it is a new sense of dignity and qualification in the man. He is looking for something more worthy of his new acquirements.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, that is very laudable for him to expect that, but that may lead to disappointment to him, too, because they can't all find the Utopias they dream of.

Secretary BAKER. Of course, that is perfectly true, and yet I want to say just as earnestly as I can, that my own contact with that disposition in no sense shows a mere feeling on the part of the sol-

dier that having saved the country, somebody has got to carry him around in the hollow of his hand. There is none of that—less than none—but there is a very earnest feeling on the part of the soldier that by reason of these qualifying experiences he is able to do more in civilian life than he did before.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad you expressed that particular point. Mr. Secretary. You think, then, that he don't imagine he is a demigod or a superman, or anything of that kind, by reason of the excellent record he has made across the water?

Secretary BAKER. As a matter of fact, he is so amazingly modest that you can't get one to tell you what he did.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a very gratifying statement. Now let me ask you another thing. Do you think any considerable number of them expect the Government to give them large sums of money as a gift?

Secretary BAKER. No; they do not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Don't you think they resent that idea?

Secretary BAKER. I haven't heard any resentment of that. I haven't heard any particular interest in it, one way or the other.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, there are a number of people advocating that soldiers be given the same amount of money that they were receiving when they quit their jobs to fight; for that amount to be given to them in a lump sum. There have been a number of papers established, I would say, advocating that particular proposition. They have no sympathy for that plan, have they?

Secretary BAKER. I don't think they have any very keen sympathy with it; but, of course, you can get up a paper based on the idea of giving any group of people something for nothing, and it will be very popular with that group of people if you keep at it long enough.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it popular with the soldiers?

Secretary BAKER. It is not popular with them yet. The inspiration doesn't come from the soldiers.

Mr. TAYLOR. You don't think, Mr. Secretary, that the soldiers want to be paid a straight bounty for what they did in the war?

Secretary BAKER. No; I don't think so. I think not. I think that the soldier's feeling is that provision for his necessities between the time of his demobilization and the time of his finding a job is a just assistance during the readjustment period. But I have heard soldiers repeatedly repudiate the idea that they were to be taken care of or mothered by anybody, the public or anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The letters which Secretary Lane sent out, or rather postal cards, specifically stated and informed the soldier that he was not getting something for nothing; that the land would have to be paid for and paid for with interest.

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Secretary, have you any figures showing the percentage of unemployed soldiers returned?

Secretary BAKER. Yes; Col. Woods has those figures. He has no figures that are accurate to date, because that number is shifting all the time, for the reason that men try jobs and give them up again and switch from employed to unemployed and vice versa, but he has a very accurate account—a fairly accurate account—of the number of men in each city of the United States who apply for assistance in

securing jobs and who are placed in jobs. Those figures are rather mystifying to me, because in some cities they show about 120 per cent placements. That is, they place 20 per cent more than apply for jobs. I don't know how they work that out, but I have seen those figures a number of times.

Mr. TAYLOR. Probably they place some of them twice?

Secretary BAKER. Probably, and then if he makes two applications they only credit him with one, but if they give him two jobs they call it two jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Monthly Labor Review of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, April, 1919, has this statement:

The net surplus of labor in the country during this session has been rising at the average rate of approximately 100,000 a week.

Secretary BAKER. What is the date of that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That was in April, 1919.

Secretary BAKER. Well, that whole situation is changed now.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Secretary BAKER. The whole situation is changed. The opening up of the spring with the public improvements that are possible to be carried on out of doors, and the opening up of farm occupations has changed that condition entirely.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Secretary, do you believe that a constructive program of this kind is needed in addition to the emergency methods you are using to place the soldiers in employment when they are demobilized?

Secretary BAKER. I can't say how far it will be necessary to carry this work forward. It may well be that the Secretary of the Interior will find that he will not have to go as far as the authority of this bill authorizes him to go. This is a great constructive program, and to that extent it is good. It seeks to reclaim arid or swamp lands, or otherwise unavailable land, and it has the advantage of building up the national opportunity both against the present demand and the future demand.

Mr. ELSTON. It has sort of a double value, public benefit, and at the same time it gives the soldier an opportunity to acquire a home.

Secretary BAKER. It has a double advantage. Now, it may well be that by the time the Secretary is ready to administer this bill, general industrial conditions of the country will have become temporarily or more or less permanently such that he won't find it necessary to go very fast or very far into it.

Mr. ELSTON. You understand this is a very elastic proposition, and is designed to fit only the needs as they appear, and of course there is no waste in it, inasmuch as the money is not carried in the bill, but only the authorization.

Secretary BAKER. That is what I understand, that he is given the right to go as far and as fast as the necessity justifies.

Mr. ELSTON. Do you think it is a good thing, in the way of decentralizing our population and increasing the number of farmers, and that as a matter of policy and philosophy, it is well grounded.

Secretary BAKER. Well, I hardly think I would be willing to justify it on that ground. I don't believe that you can artificially decentralize population. But that is a remote and speculative opinion.

The only way you can decentralize population is by carrying the conveniences of centralized areas into decentralized areas; building good roads, motion-picture shows, and trolley lines; improving river transportation, and all that, so that the man who lives in the country has the advantages of the man who lives in the city, so far as civilization is concerned.

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, the community center idea involved in this bill will fill that requirement.

Secretary BAKER. Undoubtedly it contributes in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Secretary, are you indorsing this bill, the idea of it?

Secretary BAKER. I am indorsing the idea.

Mr. NICHOLS. You are not indorsing the details of this particular measure?

Secretary BAKER. No; I am not commenting on that, because I don't know enough to know whether this is the way to do it or not. I am perfectly willing to rely upon the wisdom of the Interior Department and the committee to do that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Have you examined the details of this bill sufficiently to give your opinion as to the aid extended to the soldier in the bill?

Secretary BAKER. No; I can't say that I have. I have gone on the assumption that this bill provided—it put in operation an opportunity for the soldier to work on the land, making provision for settlement; and second, to settle on the land under economical and financial terms which were both possible and advantageous to the soldier. Now, if it does that, then it contributes to the welfare of the soldier, in which I am interested.

Mr. FERRIS. The high wages that prevail in the country of course lessened the necessity for a measure of this kind, don't you think, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. In other words, after the Spanish-American War wages were very low and men walked the streets in idleness; so that it would seem to me that now, with the demand for labor and the high wage scale that prevails, there is less necessity for a measure of this kind now?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. But even so, other countries are offering opportunities to their soldiers; and it is really up to this country to offer something to the soldier, to give him a chance to work out, first, a livelihood, and then a home, if he desires. Don't you think so?

Secretary BAKER. Yes; it is highly desirable. The most fortunate countries in the world are those that have unconsumed agricultural opportunities to offer to their people.

Mr. FERRIS. And of course, as you suggested a moment ago, this has two legs to it—an economic leg and a patriotic leg. In other words, if we can reduce unproductive areas to productive areas, we render the country a service.

Secretary BAKER. Undoubtedly we do.

Mr. FERRIS. And if we can offer the opportunity to acquire a home on a businesslike basis, so that the Government may get its money back in days to come, that, too, would be an advantage.

Secretary BAKER. It would be very much better than some sort of a gratuity offered to them.

Mr. FERRIS. There are some bills here, Mr. Secretary—and we have had some very good men come before this committee who have advocated the feasibility of making loans, either through the farm-loan banks or through a lump-sum fund which would be provided for, of, say, 100 per cent, to the soldier and let him buy the farm wheresoever he would, and let him pay that back in 40 years' time or 50 years' time at a low rate of interest—something along the line of the farm-loan bank—and they have thought that that was preferable to any colonization scheme or soldier-colony scheme. Would you care to comment on that phase of it? We have had a good deal of testimony along that line.

Secretary BAKER. No; I don't know enough to comment on that, Mr. Ferris.

Mr. FERRIS. You get my thought?

Secretary BAKER. Perfectly; but I think it would depend very largely upon the quantity of available land suitable to purchase.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, for example, now in a given State, we will say that under the Lane bill a feasible project, or a feasible area of land, on which a soldier colony could be established can not be found; then you are face to face with the alternative of having the soldier leave that State and remove and go to a State where he can find a feasible project, or offer him something within that State.

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And, if you don't propose to loan him the 100 per cent, it becomes then prohibitive to the soldier who hasn't anything.

Secretary BAKER. This bill does not give him 100 per cent.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, it gives him 95 per cent of the land value and about 75 per cent of the improvements, as I recall it.

Secretary BAKER. So that he has to make a down payment?

Mr. FERRIS. He has to make a down payment. And there are bills, and there are some very able Members of Congress, and some very able people out of Congress, who have been before this committee, and who have been writing us to the effect that we ought to present an alternative of some sort in States where there is no feasible project, so that the soldier might not be forced to move out of Oklahoma or Ohio or some other State in order to avail himself of some other opportunity that the Government puts forward. You have not given enough attention to that feature of it to care to express an opinion on it?

Secretary BAKER. No; I have not.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Secretary, the provisions of this bill, as agreed upon here, would make it necessary for a soldier to pay approximately \$1,200 initial payment for the land.

Secretary BAKER. \$1,200 initial payment?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. That is the land and the improvements.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is the initial payment, \$1,200, on the whole proposition, improvements and stock and everything. A soldier without any money, a penniless soldier, would be given employment, according to the terms of this bill, estimated at about \$1,200 a year—average pay to a soldier. It is also estimated that it would take a soldier three or four years to save enough to make the initial pay-

ment on the farm. Do you think that is a sufficiently liberal aid to the soldier?

Secretary BAKER. I am not sure that I understand it. He would be employed at approximately \$1,200 a year for three years?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; he would be employed at approximately \$1,200 a year. It is estimated that he possibly could save the amount of the initial payment in three or four years.

Secretary BAKER. I should think that was very generous. If I understand it, it takes a man, who has nothing, and gives him employment at approximately \$1,200 a year and places him under circumstances of living such that he can probably save one-third of his earnings. At the end of three years with his savings he is in a position to make the initial payment and to borrow the rest from the Government and go on a farm under his own ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The initial payment would vary with the project and the desires of the men.

Secretary BAKER. Undoubtedly, and according to the improvements he wishes and the amount of stock.

Mr. ELSTON. And the rate of progress with which he improves his property. Those were maximum figures given to you.

Secretary BAKER. I think that is fairly generous.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that a man making \$1,200, a man with a family, could save \$600 a year?

Secretary BAKER. I think he could have it in three or four years.

Mr. BENHAM. On the basis of 300 days' labor—and it is to be supposed this will be outside work—that has been figured all along by the members of this committee as the number of days a man would likely work. Now, what about that proposition, Mr. Secretary? You are acquainted with the general climatic conditions in the United States; is it probable that a man could work on a farm project 300 days in a year on an average throughout the United States?

Secretary BAKER. Not in farming. He could in digging trenches and putting up fences and that sort of thing.

Mr. BENHAM. Would you assume that he would want to work in the rain?

Secretary BAKER. In the rain?

Mr. BENHAM. It would be necessary for him to work in rain or in snow a good part of the time, if he were going to get in 300 days a year.

Secretary BAKER. He might have to work in the rain, but I don't think that would hurt him.

Mr. FERRIS. He has been working in worse than that over in France, hasn't he?

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think it would be a more equitable proposition to extend aid to the soldier to buy a home wherever he pleased to buy it?

Secretary BAKER. Well, that is the alternative proposition which I understood Mr. Ferris put. I think the answer to that is that it depends entirely on the locality and as to whether there are available lands to be purchased individually.

Mr. NICHOLS. They might loan not only on a farm but on a home in town or a city. They might extend a loan to him at certain interest to get himself a home in town.

Secretary BAKER. Of course any plan which extended Government aid to a man to buy a home, whether it was a house in a city or a farm, would be wider in its effect than a plan which limited it solely to farms, because a great many discharged soldiers will in no case go on farms.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then you believe that such a proposition would be more equitable, so far as the great mass of the soldiers returning are concerned?

Secretary BAKER. Well, I don't like to say yes to that.

Mr. NICHOLS. You mean that you don't think that is a wise thing to do?

Secretary BAKER. No; I don't mean that at all. It may well be that Congress ought to follow this with some legislation of somewhat similar character, addressed to men who want to acquire homes in cities where they are going to do industrial work.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Secretary, that is an entirely different proposition from this. You wouldn't advise that the two propositions be brought together in the same bill, would you?

Secretary BAKER. I think not.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, I was asking the Secretary, as the head of the War Department, whether he thought that an opportunity ought to be extended to every soldier who wants to avail himself of the opportunity to have a home and to be aided by the Government to have a home wherever he wants it, whether in New York City or out in the arid lands of the West.

Mr. TILLMAN. Everybody understands that, but I simply suggested that the two propositions should not be combined in this bill.

Secretary BAKER. Every soldier should have an equal opportunity, no matter where is going to live.

Mr. TILLMAN. The two propositions are entirely different, though, are they not?

Secretary BAKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are taking care of soldiers in a vocational way, are you not, Mr. Secretary, assisting them to learn trades?

Secretary BAKER. Wounded soldiers; the well soldier is not being assisted.

Mr. NICHOLS. Not all soldiers, though? The crippled ones you are giving a vocational education.

Secretary BAKER. All the wounded men and sick soldiers; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, Mr. Secretary, we thank you very much.

Secretary BAKER. I am very happy to have had the opportunity of addressing you.

Without objection, the committee will now stand adjourned until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon at 11.10 o'clock a. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, June 16, 1919.)

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, June 17, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, Mr. Wood of Indiana, is here and desires to make a statement with reference to the bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM R. WOOD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Indiana delegation had a meeting the other morning for the purpose of considering what is known as the Mondell bill. I think that was the only bill that was called to their attention. I will state very briefly that it was the consensus of opinion among the members of the Indiana delegation that the so-called Mondell bill did not meet with their approval. Every member of the delegation is heartily in favor of doing something for the soldier. They are in favor, however, of doing something that will be agreeable to the soldier primarily and not secondarily. It occurred to us that the Mondell bill is primarily a reclamation project and, so far as it interests the soldiers, that is only secondary.

There have been projects of reclamation for many years, and individually I am in favor of reclamation projects, but I believe, and I think I voice the sentiment of our delegation, that a reclamation project should not be made the basis of furnishing homes to returning soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood, do you prefer to finish your statement before any questions are asked you?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I would like to finish my statement first. In other words, that the reclamation projects should not be mixed up with any project which might be evolved for the purpose of helping returning soldiers, or if it is to be mixed up the reclamation project should be the incident and not the home for soldiers the incident.

In my opinion this project would not be practicable in our section of the country. It would be hard, indeed, to find any large acreage of land that could be subjected to making homes for the soldiers. This project might be all right in those countries where they have large areas of unoccupied lands and where they could be obtained for nominal prices, and where the settlements, such as indicated by this bill, might be made feasible. I do not think it could be done, however, in our section of the country, and I do not think it can be done in any of the old States that are now thickly settled.

To my mind whatever is done for the soldiers should be done with reference to the States and the States should be taken into consideration. Every State in the Union performed its part in this war and performed its part well. They have some interest in the future of their citizenship and the young men of their respective States. Something should be done so as to enable the States, so far as possible, to keep within their own borders these young men and to furnish them this benefit within the State rather than without the State. In other words, it is not to the advantage of the State of Indiana to subscribe to any scheme that is going to take her citizenship away from her confines.

I believe a more practicable scheme would be, first, to agree upon the amount of money that is going to be devoted to the purpose of assisting the soldiers, and then take and apportion that to the States in proportion to the number of soldiers furnished to this war. Then let each State formulate its own plan for helping its soldiers. I do not think it is going to be popular with the masses of the soldiers to say that only a scheme shall be evolved that is to help a soldier on a farm, because that will only appeal to a very few of them. We know that whatever percentage this scheme would appeal to would be the farmer boys, and thousands and thousands and tens of thousands, to my mind, of these boys who went from the farm to the war will not go back to the farm again. That was the history of the Civil War and it was the history of the Spanish-American War, that while the country furnished a very large percentage of the soldiers who participated in those wars, a very large percentage of that very large percentage did not go back again to the farms.

Now, there are lots of soldiers who would like to buy a home in a town, who would like to buy a home adjacent to the place where he is working in a shop or factory or something of that character, and it occurs to me that it would be an unjust discrimination to discriminate against that character of soldier who is desirous of being helped and who is as much entitled to help as the other man, and say to him that you can not get this help unless you go to a farm. I do not think that that is advisable.

Now, upon this settlement proposition, my observation and my reading has not been such as to convince me that it is very practicable. It has been tried in this country time and time again, and has failed every time it has been tried. Robert Daley Owen was one of the earliest men to establish a settlement of that kind, and he tried to establish a socialistic settlement down in southern Indiana.

Mr. BENHAM. New Harmony.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; New Harmony, and it failed. There have been several of these socialist settlement propositions tried out in the West and they have all failed. There have been some of lesser magnitude tried out in the South and they have failed. I do not know of one that has as yet proven a success. Perhaps that is no argument that such a thing can not be done, but I do not believe that we should bend our energies here in taking advantage of this psychological situation in projecting a scheme the primary purpose of which is reclamation, and to my mind, that is all that this Mondell bill is, because the giving of a home to the soldier is simply an incident. Now, that is the attitude our people occupy.

I suspect you gentlemen have read many of the articles that have been submitted from time to time by Mr. Myron T. Herrick upon this proposition. I think one of the best things this committee could do would be to get a man who has had the experience and who has made the observation and has studied this proposition like Mr. Herrick has done and get the benefit of his experience and judgment. There are several others, I believe, whose testimony would be very edifying. This is a wonderful project that is being undertaken, and whatever project is undertaken ought to be undertaken intelligently and after consideration and the formulation of a scheme that comes from experience as far as it can be ascertained and from those who have studied this thing at close range rather than upon the advice of anybody who has introduced a bill which is the fulmination of some pet scheme of his own. There is another man, by the name of—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). What is Mr. Herrick's scheme?

Mr. WOOD. I do not know that I can speak intelligently about it, but I have in mind that while Mr. Herrick was abroad he studied the German scheme over there which had been tried for years and proven a failure. Now, what his exact scheme is I do not know, but I simply cite the fact that I know he has given it a great deal of thought, and as perhaps some of you gentlemen know he is a man of very good judgment. I suspect he is one of the most successful business men the United States has ever produced. He evolved a banking scheme in Cleveland which is unparalleled so far as efficiency is concerned. It was a savings-bank arrangement, which was to provide homes for the poor in the city of Cleveland and throughout Ohio. It has simply spread all over the State of Ohio.

There is another man by the name of Wolf who is now located in New York at 53 Chambers Street, who has tried this settlement arrangement in Los Angeles and throughout that country, and has made two or three attempts which have failed. I remember some time ago reading some article written by him in which he was setting forth the reasons why it failed. I do not know now what publication that was in.

Mr. RAKER. It was a private scheme, was it not?

Mr. WOOD. If I remember correctly, it was private in the respect that it was through an organization of a lot of private individuals, philanthropic in their character, trying to evolve some plan for the purpose either of finding homes or preparing homes or farms for Jewish people. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. Leonard Robinson, who is the president of the Federal farm loan bank at Springfield, Mass., has had considerable experience in this respect, and there is a man who has written a book on this proposition, and perhaps you gentlemen have read this book—Dr. Thomas Carver, of Harvard University. It is a textbook.

Whatever scheme is evolved, I think it ought to be after very great deliberation and thought. I can not think that the scheme which is proposed by this bill and which has for its purpose the reclamation of overflowed lands or cut-over lands or arid lands will ever appeal to the soldiers. You will not get one out of 10,000 of them to ever undertake such a project.

Mr. RAKER. Just to interrupt you right there, is it not a fact that the reason some of these schemes were not a success was on account of the people who formed this "wolfish" scheme?

Mr. WOOD. No; I do not understand that to be the case. I do not understand that to have been involved in any way in that scheme. I know it was not so far as the Robert D. Owen scheme was concerned, because if there ever was a philanthropic scheme in the world that was one of them, and I suspect it was tried out under the most advantageous circumstances, because it was in about the richest country in the world, and all they needed to have done in the first instance was to turn over the ground and plant the seeds. While it had a mushroom growth and seemed to flourish for a time, it went just like all these other schemes by and by.

Mr. SUMMERS. May I ask when that Owen scheme was tried out?

Mr. WOOD. It was 100 years ago.

Mr. SUMMERS. Do you not think conditions may have changed very greatly since then?

Mr. WOOD. I think they have, and if they have changed, I think they have changed for the worse so far as such an undertaking is concerned.

Mr. SUMMERS. And did not that scheme have a religious or a moral philosophy embraced within it and as a part of the scheme?

Mr. WOOD. That is true to a certain extent. It was not so much a religious spirit as it was an educational spirit, and out of this thing, I may say, the first concrete form for a free-school system in the United States was evolved and came from Robert D. Owen.

Mr. SUMMERS. So some great good came from it, any way?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ELSTON. Most of these schemes have a socialistic or a communal proposition behind them, where the land is held in common and there is what you might call a head or chief who assigns occupations and who has a sort of peculiar position in the cult around which this settlement is centered.

Mr. WOOD. That was true so far as the Robert D. Owen scheme was concerned, and this is a paternalistic scheme you are trying to evolve here.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wood, there is not any communistic or general ownership of the land scheme in this bill. Is not this for separate, individual homes, as you understand the bill?

Mr. WOOD. But I understand it is to be on the community plan. I do not discover anything of a socialistic proposition in it, but I do discover much of a paternalistic proposition in it.

Mr. RAKER. I have been trying to analyze that feature and have asked many questions on that subject. Do you think there is really a community plan in this scheme?

Mr. WOOD. It so states, and you take the hearings all the way through, if I have gathered anything from them, it is the purpose to establish a project here, there, and yonder, wherever they can find enough land to establish a project, where there shall be a community settlement of from 20 to more families.

Mr. RAKER. That has not been done under any of the projects so far. For instance, take the Orland project in California, where they used to be about 40 families on 15,000 acres, there are now 750 families all owning their private homes, just like any other place. Would you not think a scheme like that would be workable and would bring good results, if you can put 700 families on a tract of

land of 15,000 acres where only 40 families lived before, and lived poorly at that?

Mr. WOOD. It would depend largely, in the first place, on the kind of land you put them upon. That might work in California. It might not work in Indiana, or it might not work in Illinois, and that is one of the things I am objecting to in this scheme. If there are any places where this might be feasible, you are going to take those who are entitled to receive the benefits away from the places where they would desire to stay. My idea is that whatever help we are going to give, we should take to the soldier where he is rather than to take him away from his environments and associations of his friends and family, and so forth, or at least give him the opportunity of staying there.

Mr. MAYS. How would you get the land, Mr. Wood, unless you went where the land was?

Mr. WOOD. That is why I say it is impracticable, because of the fact you can not find the land in large bodies. That is the reason why I say there ought to be something more in this scheme than the mere helping of a man to get a farm. For instance, take a man who is working in a town and is a mechanic. He was, perhaps, a mechanic before he went to war and wants to follow his vocation. Now, then, you say to that man, "In order for you to receive any of this help you have got to quit your job as a mechanic and go out and commence something that you know nothing about at all." Now, I say that that is not a fair proposition.

Mr. MAYS. Your opposition, then, to this bill is mainly that it is not broad enough and does not comprehend the entire number of soldiers.

Mr. WOOD. That is one of the very great objections to it and that is one of the reasons why it will not prove popular.

Mr. GANDY. Let me ask you a question following the question of Mr. Mays. Then, so far as it goes, based on our experience with the reclamation projects, it does very well?

Mr. WOOD. I do not believe in the reclamation project at all as it is embodied in this bill in connection with furnishing homes to soldiers. If my scheme which I suggested awhile ago was carried out, I would make an allotment to the different States of their proportionate share of this money in proportion to the soldiers they furnished to the war, and then in those States where they have large bodies of land that can be reclaimed, let them reclaim it and make homes for the soldiers out of that land. In those States where they have no large bodies of land that need reclaiming, but where cheap lands may yet be obtained, if it is their desire, let them use those cheap lands. In other words, the people of each community know best what to do rather than people who are scattered all over the country know better what they should do. I suspect you would think it presumptuous were I to undertake to detail here what would be a good scheme for California or what would be a good scheme for Arkansas, New Jersey, Florida, or South Carolina.

Mr. RAKER. Why not?

Mr. WOOD. Although I might know something about what would be a good scheme for Indiana.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wood, I was just reading last night that we have 60,000 people from New York and, I think, 40,000 from your State

in California who have gone there to make their homes. Why should we not get the benefit of those people?

Mr. WOOD. You would get the benefit. Indiana is like Ireland; we have more citizens outside of the State than we have inside the State. We populated your country, and the people who went to California, who have made that their home, have made their contribution as residents of California to this war. They contributed their sons to this war as residents of California, and that ought to be taken into consideration. Those who did not go to California or elsewhere but who remained in Indiana ought to have the opportunity at least of keeping their boys in Indiana.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Wood, what is good farm land worth in Indiana?

Mr. WOOD. On the average, good farm land in Indiana is worth from \$350 to \$450 an acre.

Mr. MAYS. How is a young man without means going to get one of those farms?

Mr. WOOD. He can not do it. It is proposed in this bill to establish in each State, if feasible, one of these projects. Now, it would not be feasible in Indiana.

Mr. MAYS. Is that the reason you oppose it, mainly?

Mr. WOOD. No; it is not the reason. Even if it was feasible I would say it would not be fair to the other States where it is not feasible, because of the fact that I think the State has got something involved in this thing. The State has got something involved in any question that has to do with the welfare and the continued welfare of her citizens.

Mr. MAYS. Should the State insist upon holding the young men within the State when they could do better outside the State?

Mr. WOOD. No; and we can not hold them beyond a certain limitation, but we ought not to be deprived of an equal opportunity to hold them. That is the thing I am complaining about.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not true, Mr. Wood, right in that Indiana, with its dense population, and these other Eastern States which have contributed so largely and so beneficially—and I can not accent the word “beneficially” too strongly—to the West, have they not aided in making this country great and even improving your own State, and should we not continue that?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I have no objection to that if you proceed upon the theory that what helps any one section of our country helps the whole country. What I am trying to get at, and what I am trying to impress upon you gentlemen, is that you should not devise any scheme here that is going primarily to have the effect of tearing down rather than building up each individual State in proportion as its demands should be respected.

Mr. RAKER. Is all the land in Indiana which is cultivable under cultivation, generally speaking?

Mr. WOOD. No; there are some lands in the northern part of the State along the Kankakee River which are overflowed lands which might be good for trucking purposes. It never will be good for agricultural purposes because of the way the soil is constituted.

Mr. RAKER. In addition to that, is the land which is now under cultivation cultivated to its highest capacity?

Mr. WOOD. No; that is not true anywhere in the United States.

Mr. RAKER. Now, that being true, would you object to a project whereby you could put 1,000 soldiers in your State upon some of this land by dividing it up and letting them make their homes there, even if it was expensive land, because you would get returns that would be commensurate with the value of the land?

Mr. WOOD. No; I would not object to that at all, but that is not what would happen under this law.

Mr. RAKER. That is the purpose of it, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. That is the theoretical purpose of it, but the practical purpose of it would be to take them away rather than to keep them there. For instance, I do not know how large a farm you have in your mind, but under the old homestead law at the end of the Civil War we gave them 160 acres, and that has been enlarged as the good lands have been taken up and nothing left but the culls until I think the last homestead provided for a section of 640 acres, and it would take several sections at certain times of the year to get a living off of—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). I will just say in that connection, and to add to my question, that in addition to the 160 acres this same soldier was given 640 acres as a desert claim in some places and 320 acres in others and 160 acres of a timber-culture claim and 160 acres of a timber claim and 160 acres as a preemption. You see he was not confined to a 160-acre home. He could get all of this land adjoining.

Mr. WOOD. Those opportunities are now gone. Speaking with reference to the feasibility of anything of this sort in Indiana, you could not do that in Indiana because there is not anything of that sort left. But suppose you should give them 160 acres in Indiana, and you were going to form a community of 20 soldiers in one community, you would have to have 1,600 acres of land. You can not get that anywhere in Indiana unless you move somebody off of his place, and you can not do that.

I understand some one has proposed here condemnation proceedings. That would be absolutely impossible. Eminent domain is for public purposes and not for private purposes. You can not take my home and give it to somebody else for his home. You can not do that in Indiana or anywhere else.

Mr. RAKER. I do not like to interrupt you, but you are talking about a very important phase of this matter, and I think it is the very crux of this bill. If you took 20,000 acres in Indiana where there are now, say, 25 homes, and if you could get those people to dispose of their land, and then put it in shape so that you could make homes, say, for 200 of the returning soldiers, would not that be a good scheme?

Mr. WOOD. If you eliminate the "ifs," I would say yes; but those "ifs" there are absolutely destructive of your proposition. It could not be done, because you take a person who has a home on a farm in Indiana, he wants to stay on his farm. Patriotism goes so far and then stops, and our selfishness begins to assert itself, and that will be true in that case. I agree with the gentlemen that this is a wonderful scheme, and it strikes me that before we go into this venture at all we ought to give something to the soldier that means something and not give him simply an empty shell. This scheme means nothing to the soldiers except a very, very small percentage.

Mr. JOHNSON. What would you suggest, Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. My suggestion was that if we were going to be at all equitable in this help to the soldiers, it would be a fair proposition to first agree on the amount of money we feel the Government can give for this purpose; and, then, after having agreed on that proposition, to take out and apportion it among the States in proportion to the number of soldiers they sent to the war, and then let each individual State determine what is best for them to do to help the soldiers in their community.

Mr. ELSTON. Would you limit that to the soldiers from that particular State or would you have it apply to all soldiers who might flock in?

Mr. WOOD. I would have it apply to any who might want to come in, so that if a man desired to go away from Indiana to your new country and take up a farm there, he might do it; or the man who lived in your country might want to come to Indiana and establish his residence there.

Mr. MAYS. Would you permit the State to turn this money over in cash to the soldier and let him do anything he pleased with it?

Mr. WOOD. No; I would not. I would have it fixed so that the soldier would have to understand that he would have to do something himself, because any help to a man that does not encourage that man to help himself is worse than no help at all, and I would have it arranged in that way. I believe it would be feasible to have this money come back again to the United States Government. I think the States should guarantee the United States that at some time, under some arrangement that could be formulated, this money should be returned after a long number of years.

Mr. ELSTON. Would you have all advances made in all the States on a uniform basis or would you allow the States to decide on the amounts to be advanced and the rates of interest and terms, etc.?

Mr. WOOD. I would leave that to each State because of the fact that these projects would vary and the conditions in the different States would be different. Conditions that might fit and be workable in the congested countries of the East might not be workable in the West.

Mr. MAYS. After making an allotment to one State, would you permit the soldiers of that State to go to another State and get an allotment from that State?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; but I would not permit them to have both.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think Mr. Wood understood the question. Would you allow him to get an allotment from one State and then go to another States and get another allotment?

Mr. WOOD. No; I just stated I would not permit him to take advantage of both.

Mr. WHITE. Might not that disturb the equilibrium of the division? Take a good State like Oklahoma, everybody might want to go there and settle, and that State would not have money enough to go around.

Mr. TAYLOR. And might not the States begin bidding against each other and bring about an unfortunate condition in that way?

Mr. WOOD. That is the very objection I have to this scheme of yours—because of the fact that it is giving a certain section of the country a bidding chance against other sections of the country when they, in turn, have nothing to offer.

Mr. MAYS. Does not that very fact tend to relieve the congested conditions in this older settled country?

Mr. WOOD. It has; yes, sir; and I firmly think that we should, in so far as we can, keep up the equilibrium and encourage back-to-the-farm propositions.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Wood, referring to the price of land in Indiana, is it not a fact that you can buy whole counties out in Indiana at an average price of \$50 an acre in some sections of the State?

Mr. WOOD. No; it is not.

Mr. BENHAM. I think that is so in the southern part of the State.

Mr. WOOD. You say a whole county?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes; at an average price of \$50 an acre.

Mr. WOOD. If that is true at any place at all, it would be in the hills and hollows along the Ohio River; but who would want to send a soldier down there?

Mr. SUMMERS. They make mighty good fighters down there.

Mr. WOOD. Certainly, they make mighty good fighters, but they can not raise very big crops of wheat down there. It may be brought into use later, because we are discovering that we can raise some of the finest kind of fruit down there.

Mr. BENHAM. They do raise crops of tobacco down there that bring \$400 an acre.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; they raise about one crop, and that is about the end of that piece of land.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wood, you were speaking of providing for the soldiers after the Civil War. We really did not make any provision for them any different from anybody else as to the right to get public land, with the exception that they were authorized to use the time they were in the war to comply with the provisions as to residence on the homestead, and in a few instances we gave them scrip. Is not that all we did for the soldiers of the Civil War?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; but, as some one suggested, conditions have very materially changed. At that time our country was very largely agricultural. I have forgotten just what the percentage was, but I think it was about 80 per cent; and conditions have absolutely changed since then. Here is another thing: At that time the United States Government owned large areas of the best land to be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. RAKER. And it was disposed of in this way, not only to the soldier but to everybody else: First, he could make a preemption upon 160 acres by living there six months, and after having completed his final proof, and as soon as he could get a certificate of purchase, he could then file a homestead of another 160 acres, at the same time or after he had completed his preemption. There is no limitation except in the proving up on his homestead. After he had proved up on his homestead he could secure a desert claim of 320 acres, a timber claim of 160 acres, and a timber-culture claim of 160 acres, while in certain counties of the West he could get another desert claim of 640 acres, making a total of 1,280 acres.

That is the way we treated all of them when they went to the Western States, whether soldiers or nonsoldiers. But now things have changed.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; there is no comparison that can be made between the conditions that are presented to us now in connection with the disposition of the soldiers and the condition that was presented to us at the end of the Civil War.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you given any attention to the drafting of amendments to this bill of any kind that would embody your ideas?

Mr. WOOD. No; I have not. I thought that I would come and voice the sentiment of the delegation from Indiana and offer the suggestions that I have made. They may or may not be worthy of consideration. Here is what I expect you will find: You will find that there is about as large a contrariety of opinion upon this subject as there has been on any proposition that has confronted the American Congress for a long time. This difference of opinion is based upon the difference of conditions in the different sections of the country, and each one, of course, is apt to be more or less selfish about this thing. We are anxious to see what the effect of this will be upon our own particular locality. Yet, at the same time, as I suggested a while ago, I can not conceive of but very few out of the 4,000,000 boys who would be entitled to receive benefits under this bill who would take advantage of them. I think there would be a very small percentage of them who would take advantage of these benefits.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wood, suppose some of these soldiers would like to go outside of many of those prosperous towns in Indiana, say, at a distance of from 3 to 10 miles, for homes, and we should say to them, "You can get a home of an acre or 3 acres of land where you can live and go back and forth to and from your work as a mechanic, blacksmith, telegraph operator, etc." If provision were made by which he could secure such a home at a cost of, I suppose, from \$2,000 to \$3,000, don't you think it would be a good thing?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I do.

Mr. RAKER. That can be done under this bill.

Mr. WOOD. No; it will not be done under this bill.

Mr. RAKER. I know that you are mighty keen on these things, and I want to get the benefit of your good judgment and experience. The question is, if it can be done and it is a good thing, then, it would not be a bad idea to try it—is that right?

Mr. WOOD. If that would be feasible, but who knows where that would be feasible? Here is another proposition: It would be a good scheme if you would fix up some sort of measure that would help the man who did not want 3 or 4 acres of land, but who would only want a town lot to live on with his family. Suppose he has no use for 3 or 4 acres of land. What would you do with that man?

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Gandy asked a question some time ago, but I think the question was lost in the general discussion, and I would like to ask the same thing: Do you approve of this bill as far as it goes?

Mr. WOOD. No; I do not approve of it at all. I do not approve of it because the prime object of this bill is reclamation. That is the prime purpose of this bill. This bill contains a lot of things put into it to make it fit the soldier proposition, but it is what I have understood as a layman to be a reclamation scheme.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by reclamation?

Mr. WOOD. I was once a member of the Flood Control Committee, and the reclamation scheme I am most conversant with is the scheme to reclaim the overflowed lands on the Mississippi River, which is a wonderfully worthy project. There is another scheme to-day known as the Newlands scheme which is fashioned a good deal after the fellow's cat farm, which was a sort of automatic farm where the cat would eat the rat and the rat would eat the cat and the owner in turn would get the fur. The Newlands scheme was for the purpose of impounding all of the waters on those overflowed lands and using them for watering the desert lands. Under that scheme they would take water from the overflowed lands for the purpose of watering the desert lands, and if that was done everything would be rosy and practicable. Then, there have been various reclamation schemes with reference to cut-over land and with reference to a lot of Michigan land up there that will not raise beans and will not raise anything in the world. I have read these hearings, and I call your attention to the very first part of this bill. By the third section of the bill this provision is made:

That the Secretary is authorized through such agency as he may provide to engage in such undertakings and to do and perform such work as in his opinion is necessary for the permanent reclamation or development of the lands of projects, and when he deems essential to place them in condition for use and cultivation, including the building of essential public roads.

Now, what would the present Secretary of the Interior do under that? He is so thoroughly wedded to reclamation projects that he has been preaching and advocating them all over the country in speeches, and the authorization given by that very clause would be used for those reclamation projects.

Mr. RAKER. Then, you are not so much opposed to the proposed bill in the main, so far as its execution is concerned, but what you are afraid of is the enforcement of it?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; that is what I am afraid of under this bill, as sure as you are born.

Mr. RAKER. Let me ask you one other question: We have all voted, and I believe you have voted, to appropriate money for the improvement of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That is a long way from the East and a long way from the West. Now, if some of these benefits came to Idaho and resulted in the improvement of that State, then it would not be a bad thing?

Mr. WOOD. No, sir; I want some benefit to go to Idaho, some to California, and some to Indiana.

Mr. BARBOUR. Are you opposed to the bill because of its reclamation provisions?

Mr. WOOD. I am opposed to the bill because reclamation is the prime object of the measure. I think that I can see in this bill all that there was in the original reclamation bill, or the reclamation bill that was introduced into Congress some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. For the reclamation of arid lands?

Mr. WOOD. That is one of them. I can see in this bill all that there was in the others, except for the camouflage that is put about this

bill for the purpose of making it appeal to the people of the United States as being a help to the soldiers in securing homes.

Mr. MAYS. If the lands at present being cultivated are so high priced that it is impracticable to get enough of them for soldiers, how are you going to get land except by reclamation or by using land that is not now in cultivation?

Mr. WOOD. That would be all right. Out in your State you would get a certain amount of money from the United States Government for the purpose of assisting soldiers to get homes, and it would be feasible in your State to use it for the purpose of reclaiming those lands for the soldiers. But we could not do that in our section because we have not the lands to reclaim, but we might take our proportionate share of that money, and procure farms here and there without having the community idea involved in it.

The soldier boy could be placed on it where he could have a home and farm, and we might help the soldier boy who is living adjacent to a factory and who wants to continue work as a mechanic to get a home. You might help him, too. The environment and problem of each State may be peculiar to itself, and the conditions as to land are such that there is practically no one set of rules applying to one that would be absolutely applicable to another, and whatever help is offered by the United States Government ought to be equitable so as to help the people of every community in the same degree.

Mr. MAYS. When you had up the proposition to improve the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, you received the help of the entire country, and our Western States did not make any question of it, although we did not get any benefit from that.

Mr. WOOD. No; but I will tell you what you did have: They included California in that bill that provided for the Mississippi River improvement, and the only appropriation made was for the California project. The war came along and stopped all of the other work. I am in favor of the continuation of that work, and I am in favor of a reclamation scheme backed by the United States Government to have effectively reclaimed those overflowed lands on the Mississippi River. That would be a success on the basis of an investment, and the figures show that it would bring in a valuable return in a short time. However, I am not in favor of making a reclamation scheme the prime object, with a secondary object of providing homes for soldiers, because the soldiers may not want that.

Mr. MAYS. If he does not want to, he does not have to.

Mr. WOOD. Of course not. Now, I think that we are big enough, or ought to be big enough, to separate those projects. I do not think that one of them ought to be confused with the other, for the reason, as I have stated before, each State will have the same interest in the allocation of this money, and the United States, as the United States, will, of course, be interested in this problem.

Mr. MAYS. After reclaiming this land, would you object to giving the soldier a preference right to a piece of land?

Mr. WOOD. Absolutely not.

Mr. MAYS. That is about all that this bill would do.

Mr. WOOD. No; I think not. If this thing should broaden out in its scope, as it could do, then your \$500,000,000 would not be a drop in the bucket, because of the fact that the most of this scheme that I have mentioned is for the reclamation of waste land.

Mr. RAKER. Let me ask you one other question: Assuming that your objection would be good, that certain States can not get tracts of land that can be operated as a workable project but that in other States there are feasible places or feasible projects where land, water, and climate combine to make them workable so as to provide homes for at least 100,000 soldiers who are ready, willing, and anxious to go upon that land, would you not think that would be a good thing?

Mr. WOOD. I know it would be good for the West. If we have that sort of idea, why not take the United States and divide it up into sections?

Mr. RAKER. I am opposed to sectionalism. I am opposed to zone systems of all kinds.

Mr. WOOD. I did not mean to propose to make of it a sectional matter, but I was referring to the sections for the purpose of distributing this money. You ought to know as practical men that this reclamation business or settlement is not practicable in all sections under this scheme. It is not practicable in the State of Indiana; it is not practicable in the State of Ohio; it is not practicable in the State of Illinois, and I do not think it is practicable anywhere in the East, although it may be practicable in this entire western section of the country. If you want to do this thing, why not draw your line somewhere and work out a practicable plan that would apply to each respective section.

Mr. FERRIS. We are informed that about 67 per cent of the soldiers have been demobilized and that the rest of them will be demobilized very rapidly. Now, it is your thought that it is up to the Government to show some appreciation of those soldiers in the form of a bonus or reward, is it not?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And it is your thought that there is a feeling among the soldiers that something ought to be done?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, your thought is—and I confess that I have been somewhat worried along the same lines—your thought is that this plan for the colonization of the soldiers in groups on particular tracts of land would not be feasible in sections where high-priced lands exist?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. FERRIS. But your thought is that that might work in the Western States?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And, perhaps, in some of the sparsely settled sections of the Southern States, where lands can be bought for three, four, five, and six dollars per acre?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Speaking now for the benefit of the committee, why would it not be possible to preserve the good there is in this bill for the Western States, and then provide an alternative proposition along the line of your suggestion that would be applicable to States where this colonization plan seems to be unsuitable?

Mr. WOOD. That is the suggestion I offered to Mr. Raker—that is, if you can draw the line or if you can figure out on the map a plan whereby it would be possible to apportion or allot these benefits among the various sections of the country, it should be done. Then,

in the territory where it is feasible to apportion it it should be done so that they can apply it there to suit themselves.

Mr. FERRIS. Would not this be a better plan than to turn over a lump sum to the several States and let them administer it?

Mr. WOOD. It might be. The only difference is that this last suggestion is only enlarging the unit. I admit this, that the general conditions throughout Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and all that section—

Mr. TAYLOR (interposing). And Iowa.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, Iowa. I expect they are concerned with reference to this thing. I think I can see how some scheme could be evolved to cover all sections of the country, but it would be quite a different scheme in all this territory where you have the least area of unoccupied land.

Mr. FERRIS. The soldier proposition being a national proposition, would it not be an error to turn it over to the several governors of the States?

Mr. WOOD. Some mistakes would be made, but to my mind they would be infinitely small as compared with the mistake that you would make if you adopt this general scheme.

Mr. FERRIS. Why could not an alternative plan be incorporated in this bill, preserving the colonization plan of settlement for the Western States and making a practical enlargement of the farm-loan plan with a view to lending to the soldier in Indiana, Illinois, Oklahoma, and Iowa a sum sufficient to enable him to acquire a home isolated or segregated from the rest or outside of the colonization plan?

Mr. WOOD. That might be done.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask you one other question—and I do not know whether it has been already injected into the record: What do you think of the proposition of authorizing the Federal Government to make advances for 40 years at 4 per cent, tax exempt, of \$2,500 to each of the 4,000,000 soldiers who desires to avail himself of the privilege, the soldier to apply it to the acquisition of a home, with a restraint upon the alienation of it for the soldier's own protection? The proposition, stripped of all details, would be for the Government to advance to each soldier \$2,500 for 40 years at 4 per cent interest, provided the soldier should apply it to the purchase of a home, such loan to be tax exempt?

Mr. WOOD. What would you do with reference to security?

Mr. FERRIS. The Government would hold the land as security, and would place restrictions on alienation for the soldiers' protection.

Mr. WOOD. That might be feasible, but it would take an awful lot of money.

Mr. FERRIS. I have figured it out, and if every one of the 4,000,000 soldiers should avail himself of this \$2,500 loan with which to make a payment on a home, wherever it may be, whether in Indiana, Idaho, California, or Maine, the total amount would be \$10,000,000,000, and that is not as much as we have loaned the Allies. That does not scare me, I will state for the record.

Mr. WOOD. It does not scare me. I am in favor of any scheme which would make each man coming back from France a home owner in the United States. That is the best guarantee we have against unrest.

Mr. FERRIS. Would not that be an equitable proposition?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. After paying \$2,500 for a home for the soldier, what would you do about giving him a job?

Mr. WOOD. Of course, that is another proposition. Any proposition that is going to be suggested is going to be fraught with many difficulties.

Mr. MAYS. A city home is not much of a source of income.

Mr. WOOD. That character of home, of course, would be for the benefit of the soldier who wanted to live adjacent to his work.

Mr. FERRIS. It has been suggested by Mr. Smith that that might not bring about the object of making unproductive acres productive, and that might be subject to criticism, but I do not think that is necessarily true, because why could not a man in Idaho borrow \$2,500 from the Government for the purpose of improving a section of land, or why could he not acquire the land if he wanted it?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you favor that \$10,000,000,000 proposition that Mr. Ferris spoke of?

Mr. WOOD. Of course it is like the old maid who was asked to marry, it comes pretty sudden, and possibly this might work out all right. I am in favor of making home owners of the soldiers of this country.

Mr. FERRIS. Every soldier would feel that he had a chance to get something.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, and there is this advantage in that proposition, that there would not be the objection that would arise from those boys who do not want to go out and build homes on reclamation projects. Thousands of them would be heard to complain about that, because it would not be giving them a fair chance.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of those settlements on reclamation projects. Have you ever been on one of those settlements?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, I was on one in Florida that I thought would be a happy consummation of one of the finest undertakings ever suggested in our section of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was it?

Mr. WOOD. It was near Dupont, in Florida. It was in two or three counties.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that a colonization plan?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, but it did not work.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been on the Greeley settlement in Colorado, or on a Mormon settlement in Utah?

Mr. WOOD. No; I have never been there. I do not know anything about it, except in a general way that the Mormons do make effective their undertakings in the establishment of colonization concerns, but we do not want our soldier boys to be Mormons in order to be successfully colonized.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know anything about the Greeley settlement in Colorado?

Mr. WOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about the settlement that Mrs. Lunn has referred to in her statement?

Mr. WOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the Meadowbrook Farm, but the trouble there was that they had more poets and philosophers than potato diggers.

Mr. WOOD. No; that was not the case. It was because of dissensions. They went along very well for a certain length of time, and it bid fair to be a great success, but there were dissensions that arose and it simply went to pieces. That was on the community plan, with community storehouses and everything else.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, they have made a great success in Colorado and in Utah, and on everyone of those irrigation projects there is a community settlement. It is perfectly natural—

Mr. WOOD (interposing). That is why it succeeds. It must be done naturally. That sort of colonization plan is quite a different sort of colonization plan from this.

The CHAIRMAN. Your main objection to this bill, I take it, is on account of its being a real reclamation proposition, or a proposition to remove stumps, drain wet lands, and irrigate arid lands?

Mr. WOOD. That is one of the objections, but the chief objection is that it will not do for the soldier what the Government intends should be done or what the people of the country desire to be done for the soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, that is not the sole purpose of the bill. Let me explain to you that the Secretary of the Interior and every man who has appeared before this committee, and every writer upon this subject refers to lands in the Eastern States, Northeast, and North, aside from the West. Those States have been referred to as containing idle lands and tenant farms. It is the purpose of this bill to take up such places, and the Secretary of the Interior has repeatedly referred to a great area that can be taken up in the Northern States. He spoke of land within 50 miles of the city of Washington. It is an absolute misrepresentation to dub and stigmatize this bill as being solely for reclamation purposes.

Mr. WOOD. In answer to that, I will say that all of the working machinery for the purpose of carrying out this project is left in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BARBOUR. The governors of the States are named and the Farm Loan Board, and they are to approve and select each one of these projects for the purpose of fixing the price and determining the method.

Mr. WOOD. I think that is after it is selected, and, after all, it is ultimately left to the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not a project shall be selected in any State. That is what I am objecting to.

The CHAIRMAN. Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, was before the committee, and he stated that the projects that could be taken up the earliest and the cheapest lay in the Eastern States. Now, you say it ultimately rests with the Secretary of the Interior, but you should bear this in mind that this bill merely provides for an authorization, and the Secretary of the Interior can not spend one dollar of the amount authorized to be appropriated here until the following steps are taken: He has got to select some project, that project must be approved by the Federal land bank and by the governor of the State, and then he must run the gauntlet of the Appropriations Committee, and after that the matter must be approved

by the House and Senate. The Secretary of the Interior has no carte blanche in this matter.

Mr. WOOD. We know from very recent experience the disadvantage under which the Appropriations Committee labors in contests with the various heads of the executive departments with reference to any character of these projects. We ought not to delude ourselves with the idea that, if this thing is established according to the plan suggested in this bill, the chief or head of this department, and I do not care who it is, will not be the dominating influence in the carrying out of the scheme.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that in none of the projects in the Reclamation Service, to which you directed some slight criticism, has there been any community settlement or what you would call a community settlement?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. RAKER. All of them are on the open, individual, separate farm basis, just as prevails in every State of the United States.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. It has not been done, and there have not been any community settlements. Now, take these various projects: Are there any of them that, to your mind or knowledge, are not making a success to-day?

Mr. WOOD. I know of one or two that I have been connected with that did not make a success.

Mr. RAKER. I am talking about those under the supervision of the Government. Of course, I know there have been many individual schemes whereby somebody has started out to make a fortune at the expense of poor people, and those projects have failed.

Mr. WOOD. The Government has never undertaken any settlement or community scheme. The Government proffers a chance to you or to anybody that comes along to take up a homestead claim, but the Government has never undertaken any colonization scheme.

Mr. RAKER. Then, under the reclamation law—and as you say this has reclamation in it, and that must be true, and also the drainage of swamp lands and the improvement of cut-over lands—there has been no community settlement about them, but they have been made a success or a success now. Now, if that is a fact, why should we say that this scheme as presented to the committee might be a failure, when everything we have done up to date in the way of reclamation has been a success?

Mr. WOOD. Now, admit your premises, and admit that the Government might undertake to reclaim the overflowed lands adjacent to the Mississippi River, in the Mississippi River country, and establish them so they will be perfectly safe against overflow, and then you take and apportion that land among the soldiers who came back from the war, have you not done an injustice to the man who does not want to go onto those lands? That is, if that is the only project you establish.

Mr. RAKER. But suppose you have five times as many soldiers as you can provide for on this very land; if you can provide for 100,000 of those soldiers on the Mississippi Valley land as designated by you, would it not be a good thing?

Mr. WOOD. Of course, it would, but would it not be an equally good thing to provide for the soldiers in the cities and in the manu-

facturing centers, who are entitled to as much help as these boys going on the farm?

Mr. MAYS. Do you not see the benefit of relieving the congestion in the cities, along with the other benefits in the bill?

Mr. WOOD. Absolutely; that feature is all right, but you can not discriminate entirely against the cities, and you can not discriminate entirely against the soldier boy who does not want to go to the country, and wherever you do that you are going to cause bitterness and hate, whereas by some scheme properly worked out that would give all at least a chance to participate, you have removed that difficulty.

Mr. MAYS. The cities have been increasing in population much faster than the country.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. Is it not necessary to relieve that tendency at least to some extent?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; but do not relieve it through this kind of a scheme.

Mr. MAYS. What would be your scheme which would relieve that situation?

Mr. WOOD. My scheme would be a general reclamation scheme that would stand on its own bottom. Do not make the boys a party to this scheme because when you do, where you are going to satisfy 1 you are going to cause dissatisfaction to 100.

Mr. MAYS. Would you be in favor of a general reclamation scheme independent of the relationship of the soldiers to it?

Mr. WOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. MAYS. I think I asked you practically the same question before; but would you object to giving the soldier a preference right in getting a home?

Mr. WOOD. I would be in favor of that, too.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Wood, it has been stated by the author of this bill that it would probably not afford aid to more than 1 per cent of the soldiers. Assuming that to be true, what would be the effect of that on the mental attitude of the 99 per cent who are not helped?

Mr. WOOD. It would make the 99 per cent who are not helped feel very much aggrieved.

Mr. SMITH. Judge, do you not realize that building up waste places, starting new communities, and opening up great tracts of land to cultivation will make a market for the things these other soldiers living in the cities will manufacture, and in that way will be of benefit to them?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; but that is so very indirect that you would have a good deal of trouble convincing the soldier who did not get any direct help that he was being helped in that way at all.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not true that 1,000 farmers will support a city of about 10,000 people?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. If you had one scheme to develop 30,000 acres of undeveloped land by the soldiers, and another scheme to develop a town which would satisfy the wants of those men living in the country and help that many more men—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). I want to say that on yesterday I was over in New York welcoming home from France about 600 Idaho boys. I talked with them about this proposition, and I find that the professional men and the mechanics were just as enthusiastic about it as were the farmer boys, because they realize that there

would be employment for them in connection with building up settlements, following their trades and engaging in mercantile activities. I think you are mistaken when you proceed on the theory that the soldiers who are not farmers are going to be dissatisfied with this sort of legislation.

Mr. WOOD. This may have the effect of changing human nature, but I do not believe it will.

Mr. SMITH. It has been demonstrated out in the western country that when you establish one of these projects, only a comparatively small proportion of people go on the land and the others go into the community and start stores and manufacturing interests of different kinds, and then we send great sums of money east to buy the things which you manufacture in Indiana and other States in Middle West and East.

Mr. WOOD. That is a natural saturation by individual efforts. That is not a project of governmental aid.

Mr. SMITH. But in order to undertake these great projects you must have the Government behind them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Smith, do you think there are any great number of soldiers who have not had farming experience who will take advantage of this aid?

Mr. SMITH. I think it is quite true that a good many of them will, because they have become accustomed to out-door life while in the Army and prefer some business out in the open.

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH. They have been accustomed to out-door life for the last two years, and a great many of them will want to get into agricultural pursuits.

Mr. MAYS. As I understand it, one of your chief objections to this bill is the fact that it will not appeal to the soldiers?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. And that very few of them would take advantage of it?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. If this bill were to provide an opportunity for all that wished to take advantage of it, then the others who did not wish to do so, would not have any bitterness in their hearts, would they?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; they would.

Mr. MAYS. Why?

Mr. WOOD. Simply because some scheme was not offered to them. They would say that you have simply picked out the farming industry of this country.

Mr. MAYS. The opportunity is offered to them if they wish to take advantage of it.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; but they are not farmers. I want to say to you that the gentleman here says he thinks a number of boys who are not farmers will take advantage of this scheme. I think the percentage would be very small. A farmer is made from the time he is 3 years of age, when he grows up on a farm, to 17 years of age.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Wood, we find from actual experience that on these reclamation projects which have been provided by the Government that a great many people who know nothing about farming have taken advantage of the opportunities and have made good farmers. Mr. Smith will bear out that statement.

Mr. SMITH. That is absolutely so.

Mr. WHITE. Is that the general rule or the exception?

Mr. MAYS. It is not the exception.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Wood, are you familiar with the attitude of other governments with regard to the treatment of their returning soldiers?

Mr. WOOD. No; I am not; and that is the reason I thought it would be a good suggestion for you gentlemen to get somebody who is to tell you about that. Mr. Herrick could give you some very good information on that proposition.

Mr. RAKER. Do you know, from the history of this country or any other country relative to prior wars, of a country doing anything for its soldiers except giving them a pension and authorizing or giving them grants of land?

Mr. WOOD. I have understood that Germany tried some colonization scheme and that it was a failure.

Mr. RAKER. Outside of Germany, are you familiar with what this country has done relative to giving its soldiers tracts of land?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir. I am not familiar with anything except in a general way with what our country did and what I have heard with reference to Germany.

Mr. RAKER. This country has never attempted to do anything for its soldiers of prior wars except to give them a pension and authorize them to take up tracts of Government lands under better conditions than someone else.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. If that is true, and if no other means can be devised, is it not a fact that where the land is located and where the Government has it, if the soldiers think it is right and if everybody has thought that it is right, the man must go from where he lives to where the land is located.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; if you admit that premise, but I am not going to admit that. I am not going to admit that this is the only scheme that can be devised.

Mr. RAKER. None other has been thought of by the mind of man up to the present time except to give tracts of land to returning soldiers.

Mr. WOOD. Well, but we have not reached our limitations, I hope, in ingenuity, and I believe this committee, if it will simply get down to brass tacks, will work out some suitable scheme.

Mr. RAKER. In order to carry out a similar plan to what has been done following prior wars, namely, the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War of 1861-1865, and the Spanish-American War in regard to the ration of land, we have to let the men go to where the land is situated; is not that true?

Mr. WOOD. That is true; but that can not be any criterion at all for this situation, because the whole topography of the country has been changed. We have changed from a desert, practically, into a thickly populated country. The economic conditions have changed, the social conditions have changed, and all those things have got to be taken into consideration, and what you did to satisfy the soldiers of prior wars can not be taken for comparison now at all.

Mr. RAKER. If that law works all right, and if the people were satisfied with it, and if they realized that when they took a tract of Government land they had to leave their homes and go to where the land was, and nobody has claimed that if to-day we have 10,-

000,000 acres of Government land that can be put under cultivation and good homes made for these soldiers by giving them a proper grant and proper assistance, that we ought not to do it to-day.

Mr. WOOD. You ought to do just as much as you can to help the farm boys who were soldiers, and you ought to do just as much as you can to help the boys who were not farm boys but were soldiers also.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood, will you give us your concrete plan?

Mr. WOOD. I have not worked it out. The suggestion I made as a basis upon which a plan might be worked out so that it would be equitable at least, would be to take and first agree upon the amount of money that you are going to give to the soldiers, then apportion it among the several States, and let them provide their own schemes for its application, or adopt the scheme suggested by Mr. Ferris, and divide the country into areas and apportion the money to one scheme which is actually possible for the purpose of developing the lands in that area, and apportion the money to another that is not agricultural; in other words, allow them to make a choice and have an alternative, but give every fellow a chance to be helped. That is what I am after.

Mr. WHITE. Did you mean to use the word "give" in speaking of the amount you would give the soldier?

Mr. WOOD. What I meant to say was, first agree on the amount of money that the Government is going to expend for the purpose of helping the soldiers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Advance to him, you mean.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; and apportion that among the several States. I am not in favor of giving the soldier anything with the idea that you are giving him something that he is not going to return.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are not in favor of a bounty proposition, are you?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood, you spoke of the failures in Germany. This bill is the result of an investigation made by Mr. Elwood Mead and other commissioners in Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and all countries providing any kind of a project. We had the fruit of his ripe experience and knowledge of that investigation covering nearly two years, and his ideas are incorporated in this bill. You have quoted from Mr. Merrick. Have you read his articles?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I have read Mr. Herrick's articles but it has been some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think he has been fair in his explanation of this plan?

Mr. WOOD. Oh, I have not read his articles with a view to being critical on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Was your viewpoint colored by the propaganda he is putting out?

Mr. WOOD. No; I have not seen anything he has written for a long, long time. This business has been a fad of Mr. Herrick's for years.

The CHAIRMAN. Every member of the House has received a letter from Mr. Merrick and I have it here.

Mr. WOOD. I refer to Mr. Herrick.

Mr. SMITH. Who is that gentleman, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Merrick.

Mr. SMITH. Who is he—the editor of some farm journal?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is the most misleading stuff I have seen. It absolutely misstates the purpose of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is he?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Merrick.

Mr. WOOD. I do not know anything about Merrick. I am talking about Mr. Herrick. I never heard anything of that other fellow.

Mr. RAKER. You are talking about Gov. Herrick.

Mr. WOOD. I am talking about Myron T. Herrick, who at one time was governor of Ohio. I do not know anything about that other man.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call the attention of the committee to the stuff this editor, Mr. Merrick, is sending out.

Mr. RAKER. I was sure that Mr. Wood referred to the ex-governor of Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to call the attention of the committee to this stuff. Here are newspaper clippings that people are asked to cut out and send to Congressmen, entitled, "Vigorous protest to Congress against the Lane bill to spend \$500,000,000 reclaiming distant swamps and deserts for soldiers," and so on. It is dubbed and stigmatized as a swamp plan and an arid-land scheme, and nothing else. I supposed that was the man you were referring to.

Mr. WOOD. No; and I do not want to be understood as confusing that gentleman with Mr. Herrick, because Mr. Herrick is a very high-class gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman you refer to was formerly governor of Ohio?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is this fellow that gets this literature up? Where is his paper published?

The CHAIRMAN. It says "Farm and Home Paper," and it is published at Springfield, Mass., and Chicago, Ill.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I ask Mr. Wood a question? Do you think that under this bill if 50 per cent of the soldiers who participated in this war sought to avail themselves of the opportunity, this bill would take care of that many?

Mr. WOOD. I do not think so. I do not think it would take care of 10 per cent of them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is not this bill necessarily limited?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I think it is limited.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Wood, I understand your opposition to the bill is largely because it does not take care of all the soldiers, especially those in Indiana, for instance. Now, you have not any project, evidently, that could be made available in Indiana under this bill. Do you not think it would be proper and wise legislation to enact this bill so as to start these reclamation projects in States where they would be feasible?

Mr. WOOD. I think it would be a splendid idea to start your reclamation projects as reclamation projects.

Mr. SMITH. And give the soldiers the preference right?

Mr. WOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH. That is all there is to the bill, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Now, that is not all there is to the bill, because you are offering nothing to any one else.

Mr. SMITH. But when you build up a community are not other people going to get a benefit from that?

Mr. WOOD. But you are saying to everybody who wants to take advantage of this situation, "You must go on a farm," and that is an unfair proposition.

Mr. SMITH. We can pass another bill to benefit soldiers in other activities in life.

Mr. WOOD. I think you had better put it altogether and not start something that is going to array one class of these soldiers against the other. That is one thing you should avoid.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Wood, I want to ask you a question or two suggested by a question that was raised by Mr. Ferris. You made the statement here a moment ago that the training of a farmer began from the time he was a boy 3 years old until he was 17, and I heartily approve that statement.

Now, there will be thousands and hundreds of thousands of those soldiers who are sons of farmers and who, as you have suggested, will not care to go to any projects, or who will not care to leave their homes, but who are not able to engage in farming because they have not the capital, but under the proposition suggested by Mr. Ferris, under an agency established by the Secretary, it would be possible to lend those men certain sums and then allow them to select segregated tracts. They will be absolutely familiar with the conditions; they would have had training all of their lifetime, from childhood up, on the farm, which would be a good guarantee of success. Don't you believe that from the standpoint of solvency, the Government would be as fully safeguarded in an investment of that kind as it would be under any reclamation scheme?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I think that is true. Here is what you will find true of every settlement: I remember when I was a little boy there used to be great wagon trains going from our country to Kansas and Nebraska. There was always a very considerable percentage of those who left who became dissatisfied and came back, just as there would be a very considerable percentage of those that would go on these projects that you are proposing here, but they would not become dissatisfied if they had the money with which to establish themselves in their own communities.

Mr. WHITE. That question is well answered, and I thank you. I want to ask you another question: Is it not your calm judgment that the value of the lands in the United States, including stump lands, swamp lands, etc.—although I do not know that this will apply so well to lands susceptible to irrigation—but is it not true that the value of lands available for agriculture, but not used in all of the great farming sections of the United States has been pretty accurately gauged by the genius of investment? Has not the genius of investment pretty accurately gauged the value of those lands at the present time?

Mr. WOOD. That would be my opinion, and I think that is true.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you think that the investment or segregated investment—and, of course, this committee knows that I am in favor of segregated investments—I do not know how they found it out, but they know it—don't you believe that many thousands and tens of thousands of soldiers, who, on account of early associations or home associations, and on account of the fact that they

would have the advantage of the counsel of their parents and others who are directly interested in them, and on account of having the confidence of the business men and bankers who know their quality, would, from the standpoint of prospective success, have a better opportunity to succeed by remaining in their own communities rather than living in communities with which they are not familiar?

Mr. WOOD. That is my judgment. With the same conditions existing in both places, the man at home among those who know him, and among those with whom his character itself would be an asset, would have a considerable advantage over the man or boy who left home and established himself among strangers where his character would not be an asset to him. In other words, with the same opportunities otherwise, the boy who remained in his own community would be likely to get along a great deal better than one who went into a strange country.

Mr. WHITE. Do you know, Mr. Wood, that in all the counties in agricultural sections of the United States there are farm agents?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. In my State that is the rule. Those farm agents are employed for the reason that they are thoroughly familiar with the methods of agriculture, the qualities of soil, and everything of the kind, in the county where they are giving service. Now, don't you believe that those men are fully as competent, or more competent, or are likely to be more competent, to advise those young farmers than men who are doubtless supervising what is, in a large sense, a problematical proposition

Mr. WOOD. That is manifestly true. To give a concrete example of that, we have some lands in our State that appear to be the most fertile lands in the world. At first blush you would think that they were, but when you begin to farm them, they prove to be a fraud and delusion. A lot of land frauds have been committed in our section in the sale of such lands. Land agents have taken men from different sections of the country and sold them these lands upon the strength of their appearance.

Mr. SMITH. Did I understand you to say in answer to a question by Mr. White that you are in favor of buying segregated sections of land at the present market value and then lend Government money to the extent of 100 per cent of the value of that land?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. WHITE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. SMITH. What percentage of the value would you propose to loan?

Mr. WHITE. I am not making any proposition, but I will make this announcement; that I will prepare an amendment to this bill at the proper time, and the committee can consider it.

Mr. SMITH. In two or three years land values might go down 25 per cent, and, if so, where would the Government's security be?

Mr. WOOD. I was out in Indiana during the vacation, and the land people told me that they were selling land at \$300 per acre in several counties, but I tell you that the men who bought the land were getting the best of it, because they were paying 50 per cent less than it was worth, as compared with its value before the war commenced.

Mr. WHITE. You seem to be familiar with land prices, and I want

to ask you whether there are any more cautious investors anywhere than the land people are?

Mr. WOOD. We have some experts at that business.

Mr. WHITE. They number by the million.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Not only those who are land agents, but the farmers themselves understand the business. They have given the matter of land values a lifetime study.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I contend that farming is the greatest science in the world, with the least known about it.

STATEMENT OF MR. R. E. SHEPHERD, OF JEROME, IDAHO.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Gentlemen, I am not going to occupy very much of your time at this hour. I came here more to listen to your deliberations than to have anything to offer, but one thing was brought out this morning that I can say something about which may be of interest to you. The question of the agency to employ in giving effect to this law. You have been questioning Mr. Davis as to whether or not the Reclamation Service has rendered a good stewardship in the work heretofore entrusted to it in the matter of reclamation of arid lands in the West. I come from the same district as Mr. Smith—the Twin Falls territory. Fifteen years ago that was nothing but sagebrush desert; there was hardly a single white person living there. All the work that has been done in that territory has been accomplished since that time. Large dams have been built and hundreds of miles of canals and ditches have been constructed. Much of this has been the work of the Reclamation Service. In this short time more than 7,500 farms have been developed in the Twin Falls country, from which over 5,000,000 bushels of wheat was sent to help feed the Allies and the East, about 30,000,000 pounds of beet sugar was produced, 5,000,000 pounds of wool and over 400,000 fat sheep and lambs were shipped to the eastern markets—wheat, sugar, wool, and meat; all most essential product for eastern trade. In exchange for all this we were liberal buyers of eastern manufactured products.

In response to the call of the Government for money that territory has returned to the United States Treasury in subscriptions to liberty loans, Red Cross activities, and all the various kinds of war work more than twice the money the Government has expended out there. It seems to me that is a view of the question that you ought to consider. It is a broad question of public policy in establishing the Reclamation Service. It has been a most important factor in this work and is now better qualified than at any previous period to undertake the great work contemplated by this bill. While I do not expect all these returning soldiers to go to Idaho, glad as we would be to have them come, I appreciate the fact that there will be equal opportunities elsewhere and the working out of the measure will open the door of opportunity in all lines of work. We want the boys to have any kind of job they can handle. The railroad will prosper, the eastern manufacturer will have new markets, and all lines of trade and business will feel the good growing out of this proposition. The Reclamation Service has proven already a mighty

good thing for the people of the East as well as the West and for the people everywhere, particularly during the recent crisis that the Government has gone through.

Now, I well remember hearing one of the leading men of the United States a few years ago say that the one great indispensable industry of the United States which was not systematized and was largely left haphazard was this great industry of agriculture; that whether a man farmed his land in the proper way or advantageously was left to luck and to the farmer's discretion. One of the great things the Reclamation Service has done is to form an agency through which the farmers can get in touch with the Agricultural Department of the United States. I think there is more intelligent farming in the communities where the Reclamation Service has done its work than in other sections of the country. I want to say to you that food production in the United States has not kept pace with our growing population according to the records of the Department of Agriculture. You know how short we are in dairy animals as well as in meat animals. There must be some intelligent leadership, and I can see in this measure an opportunity for the Department of Agriculture to work out some of its ideas and bring them directly to the people. I remember some years ago when the question of pure seed was first discussed and someone asked the question as to how much it would mean in the course of a year if there was one more kernel on each ear of corn, and the man who worked it out said it would mean over \$75,000 a year in freight alone for just one more kernel of corn on each ear. One of the results of this measure will be to extend the work of the Department of Agriculture all over the country, through the agency of the Reclamation Service, in bringing out good practice in farming.

I believe it is the agency that you can trust for the carrying out of this measure for the benefit of the whole United States. Of course, there are lots of soldier boys who are not going to take these farms. It is not to be expected; but a large number will, and in time will make a market for the product of the boys that go into manufacturing. They will help make traffic for the boys that go into railroad work, and so on. Keep in mind that there is no more land than originally created, you can multiply manufacturing plants, railroads, and commercial enterprises indefinitely with increasing population, but not so with land, the area is fixed. We must, as a matter of public policy, set in motion the agency that will increase agricultural production, making habitable and productive the waste lands of our country.

Remember the value of home builders to the country; remember the value of the man who owns his own home and his own farm. They are generally among the substantial people our country can depend upon in times of distress.

Now, with regard to the 40-year provision, it is only the man who can use money to advantage that will stay in debt 40 years. There are certain people who have a horror of debt and will pay up long before the 40-year term expires. The proposed terms will give an opportunity to acquire better live stock and better buildings, educate their children, and so on. You will find that there will be more men paying money back too soon than keeping it to the end. You can

well afford to have the farmers of the United States using 4 per cent money. It will be of great advantage to the East.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What are you connected with?

Mr. SHEPHERD. The Twin Falls North Side Land & Water Co. It is a Carey Act company. The land was opened to settlement some years ago.

Mr. NICHOLS. Under this bill do you believe that the soldier should be privileged to have more than one farm?

Mr. SHEPHERD. No, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. How do you mean that the soldier who owes the Government money could use that money instead of paying the Government what he owes?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Well, 50 per cent of it will go into better stock, better horses, better cattle, better sheep, better hogs.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you hear the statement of Mr. Davis?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. About the reason for that 40 years being in the bill?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I do not think it will take any man of ordinary ability 40 years to pay out. Any man who was good enough to fight in France will be able to pay out in less than 40 years, as far as that goes, but he will have the advantage of 40 years' credit, which will be better than a pension.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that a man who would take 40 years to pay out would be considered a success, in your opinion?

Mr. SHEPHERD. Your question is unfair. It depends on what he does with his money.

Mr. NICHOLS. How do you mean my question is unfair?

Mr. SHEPHERD. You may have an occasional man who will never pay out, but I want to say that under the provisions of this bill the average farmer, so far as his ability to pay is concerned, will be able to pay off in much less than 10 years, but there are men who can advantageously employ that money because of the low rate of interest.

Mr. NICHOLS. But that is not the purpose of the bill at all. Mr. Davis said that was in the bill for the purpose of extending that credit to a man who has to have 40 years to pay it. Now, do you believe, as Mr. Davis does, that a man who would take 40 years to pay out would be considered a success in farming?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I know Mr. Davis well enough to believe he would like to qualify that statement. I do not think he meant it that way.

Mr. NICHOLS. But I am asking you.

Mr. SHEPHERD. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. SMITH. It is not assumed that because the term is fixed at 40 years that the entryman will take that length of time. He may want to build a new house and barn or send his children to college, and he might like to take advantage of the long term and utilize his profits for these purposes instead of applying it to the loan.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Davis said he could conceive of a case where a man could not pay it in 40 years because of things that would occur in the running of the farm during the 40 years.

Mr. SHEPHERD. Oh, of course, in case a man broke his leg, or his house burned down, or his wife went crazy, cases of hard luck, but they will be a minor exception. I assume the purpose is to grant

liberal credit to these boys, which will be of great advantage in many ways. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 18, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 18, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. HAVILAND H. LUND, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL FORWARD-TO-THE-LAND
LEAGUE.**

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, please state to the committee your full name and residence, and whom you represent.

Mrs. LUND. Mrs. Haviland H. Lund, New York, and I am secretary of the Forward-to-the-Land League. Mr. Chairman, I am going to state first, because I am a woman and they are not usually supposed to have very definite ideas about matters of finance and economics, that the plans for the work in land settlement and colonization have been investigated and indorsed by bankers, economists, land dealers, and railroad colonization men.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, I do not like to interrupt you, but so we may get it in the record, will you state something about this league of which you are the secretary, its organization and membership?

Mrs. LUND. Yes. Perhaps this statement which I have written here will give that. Shall I read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Just as you please. If you can state it briefly, you may do so.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

NATIONAL FORWARD-TO-THE-LAND LEAGUE.

The Forward-to-the-Land League is a nonprofit-making but self-supporting organization to make unused land productive and profitable to the individuals who cultivate it, and who become owners of the land through their own efforts.

It will establish on land, carefully selected with regard to its particular capacities and its nearness to markets, carefully selected colonies which will be cooperative but not communistic. It will give the colonists the benefit of the best scientific advice and the best business intelligence. The colony will be conducted so that the individual members shall be able to pay for their homes and the land under expert advice and direction, and the colony is established on a sound, permanent basis.

The colony idea is almost as old as civilization. Some have succeeded. Most of them have failed. The reasons for the failures are logical. On the commercial are these:

WHY SOME FARM COLONIES HAVE FAILED.

The initial high cost of the land, including exorbitant selling cost, which ranges from 25 to 45 per cent.

The exploitation of colonists to make money for the land owner.

The character of the land itself and market inaccessibility.

Leaving the members of the young colony to work out their own salvation in fighting against obstacles they can not overcome.

The chief reasons for the failure of philanthropic land colonization have been:

Lack of good business judgment and insufficient capital.

Unwise selection of colonists.

An impractical plan of development.

Lack of intelligent cooperation.

The impossibility of fitting human beings into a mold, of compelling them to adjust to formulas, restrictions, laws, rules they do not like and will not endure.

Lack of participation, and, therefore, responsibility, on the part of the colonists.

It is much easier to get human beings back on the land than it is to keep them there.

THE HUMAN NEEDS OF COLONISTS.

A plan that can make the mere business of agriculture profitable but which fails to consider all human needs of the colonists and to meet these needs can not succeed.

Therefore it is obvious that the civic center must receive as much consideration as the industrial and commercial problems.

The Forward-to-the-Land League is unique in that only the fundamental principles, or, more accurately, the clearly defined objectives, of the league are fixed.

The organization is sufficiently elastic to make use of all methods developed by experience and experiment.

The league will adapt its plans to human beings, instead of adopting a pattern and attempting to make human beings fit into a rigid mold.

Broadly speaking, the function of the Forward-to-the-Land League is educational, to make known the practical work, to locate the land, and to secure the colonists.

MAINTAINING THE STANDARDS OF THE LEAGUE.

The business management of a colony will be under the direction of a competent and responsible organization; but in every instance the league will have supervisory direction to make sure the standards of the colony are maintained, not only with regard to economic administration, but education and the social needs of the colony.

In every instance it is desired to have the community in which the colony is established, and which must benefit enormously from it, to subscribe to the stock and bonds of the colony, so that it will have a vital interest in its success, particularly with regard to providing the best possible transportation and communication.

In certain counties there are likely to develop a group of colonies allied by a common interest.

Investigation checked by experience establish that from the beginning a colony must have under cultivation at least 50 farms as a minimum—100 is better—with the kind of soil required for the type of agriculture contemplated.

THE MINIMUM FOR EACH FARM.

There should be additional land included in the colony holding to take care of future growth in the number of colonists.

The minimum requirements for each farm are:

Five acres of cleared land immediately available for tilling.

A house of four rooms.

A barn.

One horse or mule.

One cow or goat.

Twelve chickens.

Two pigs.

Agricultural implements.

Wells, fences, and roads, as well as modern sanitary provisions.

A community center with school, church, town hall, library, store, blacksmith shop, etc.

Agricultural instructor and market expert.

Each colonist should have a certain sum of money—from \$100 to \$600—as an evidence of responsibility and good faith, but this is elastic. Character and capacity will be considered more important than capital.

LONG-TERM PAYMENTS PROVIDED.

Payments for the land and improvements will extend over a period of 20 years, with optional cash payments at any interest amortization date.

An officer of the league will establish the colony on the land and will remain until its machinery is working smoothly.

While the activities of the forward-to-the-land league are defined as securing the land and the colonists, this covers a broad field of activity.

It includes nation-wide publicity, persistent, cumulative campaigns of education, with distinct offices in important centers, bureaus of information, and a national clearing house for cooperative development, and for the vast stores of agricultural information now held in Federal and State cold storage.

It will disseminate all available information far and wide. It will cooperate with the extension department of the State agricultural colleges.

THE BROAD PLAN OF EDUCATION.

In connection with the land information bureau there will be free classes in agriculture and home economies.

A permanent land exhibit, supported cooperatively by the different States, will be maintained. This will logically develop into a national agricultural museum and become one of the most important institutions in the United States.

Because the league is an educational nonprofit-making institution, all avenues of publicity are open to it; newspapers, periodicals, moving-picture companies, the international Young Men's Christian Association, and the Chautauqua circuits will give aid. The United States Commissioner of Education and chambers of commerce are ready to cooperate.

The educational publicity, which will take advantage of every opportunity, must make the league and its work known from one end of the country to the other. It will attract prospective colonists in larger numbers than we can

CAREFUL SELECTION OF COLONISTS.

This makes possible a wise selection and grouping of individuals from the different colonies.

Customs, habits, what the scientists call the "mores" of racial groups, will be considered as carefully as their character and quality and the kind of agriculture they prefer.

The individuals for a particular colony will be chosen with care. Each will have made clear to him the privileges and obligations of citizenship in the community and in the Nation.

Here is a practical, direct, effective way of combating the destructive radicalism of which Bolshevism is the symbol. As against the promises of the agitator, the forward-to-the-land league gives actualities—visible property; a home and land, which makes him independent and a chance to earn both.

Furthermore, the colonist is protected while he is paying for his house and farm and equipment. No one stronger than he can take it from him.

PRACTICAL WORK FOR AMERICANIZATION.

It is the most practical method of real Americanization yet devised not only in its immediate but in its enduring results. It gives every man the chance to be free and independent.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE SOLDIERS.

Particularly does it offer opportunity for the returned soldiers, and they will make wonderful colonists, for they have learned the advantages and obligations of real cooperation, of accepting scientific direction and good leadership, which, in the case of the foreigner colonist, and often the American, will have to be taught.

It will be made clear that each colonist must participate in all the activities, particularly in the government of the colony, and that he must share the responsibility for their activities.

Of course, all business questions, such as the methods of payments, will be made perfectly clear in advance. In fact, the individuals will be organized as a self-governing unit before they move onto the land, which will be selected and improved for each particular group.

COOPERATION ALL ALONG THE LINE.

Just as each colony is cooperative, so will the different colony units be cooperative in so far as they have a community interest; as, for instance, in the buying of machinery and supplies, the marketing of their products, the direction of amusements, the system of education. Every proven experiment in a particular colony or outside of it will be employed for the benefit of all the colonies, to make them more progressive, to make them happier, to make them eager to improve that which is already good.

The 50-colony farm is merely the starting point. Provision for additional land is made for those who become acquainted with the colony as farm laborers and other workers whether in the colony or outside of it, to own their own farms.

Thus the league will oppose in the most effective way the evil farm peonage system which is the inevitable concomitant when capitalists operate large areas under scientific management, and which pay big profits if the owners are successful in mobilizing the labor. Intelligent cooperation can yield even larger returns under the Forward-to-the-Land League direction.

SCIENTIFIC BUYING OF THE LAND.

As to securing the land itself, the league provides wide latitude.

The league, through a subsidiary, may buy the land outright, issuing bonds in payment.

A local group may organize and provide the land because of the manifold advantages of having a colony near a population center.

Or the league may enter into a contract with an existing land company which will provide for a general supervision which will insure the standards of the league are maintained.

In every case the land must stand the most rigid tests as to its value, its productiveness, and its convenience to markets. The Forward-to-the-Land League will make sure the land is purchased at its actual worth, under a scientific system of appraisalment.

The actual capital invested in a colony would pay interest because money is as worthy of its day's wages as surely as the laborer is worthy of his hire. Agricultural bonds, bearing interest at 5 or 5½ per cent, with the land and improvements of the colonies as security, would have a fixed value. Moreover, they would be in demand in the communities whose land values and commercial prosperity would be tremendously increased by the colony.

PROTECTING CAPITAL AND COLONIST.

The same care, foresight, and business judgment must be exercised to protect the invested capital as is employed to protect the colonist.

The initial value of the land increases as it is brought under cultivation. Each colony's original assets would be quadrupled by its success. The savings alone, through scientific agriculture and cooperative effort, would more than pay interest on the indebtedness, while expert marketing would further increase the profits.

Group insurance of the colonist gives further protection to the investors as well as the colonist.

The insurance, as well as the amortized credit of 20 years or more, also protects the colonist.

Furthermore, the colonist has the privilege of relinquishing his original land and taking developed land to the amount of money he has paid in. Even should he wish to leave the colony, the colonist is secured against any actual loss.

Mrs. LUND. Connected with the league are E. J. Parker, of the Salvation Army; Dr. A. E. Roberts, of the Young Men's Christian Association; Dr. Thomas N. Carver, of Harvard, who is the author of the textbook on rural economics which is used in all of our agricultural colleges—I have a list of the names here, but like all my other papers it has become lost in this bag—Dr. M. T. Scudder, of the National Play Ground Organization; Dr. Henry R. Segar, poli-

tical economist, of Columbia University; Senators W. G. Harding, John W. Weeks, Wadsworth, Calder; Charles Schwab, Myron T. Herrick—I can furnish that list a little later, gentlemen, if you want it for the record, but perhaps that is enough. I endeavored to put on our board a member of every important church and welfare organization in order to give confidence to the people that this was not a land-selling scheme. It was part of my plan to establish this confidence of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by “I endeavored to put on our board”? I did not understand that expression.

Mrs. LUND. I endeavored to put on the board of the Forward-to-the-Land League people who were prominent in church and welfare organizations and economists as well as business men so as to give confidence to the general public, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You made up the board?

Mrs. LUND. I worked out all of the plans and formed the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Walsh of Massachusetts?

Mrs. LUND. I may say that when I was in Boston Mayor Fitzgerald called a special meeting for me in Faneuil Hall and presided at the meeting and he and Gov. Walsh were familiar with my plans and expected to help put it across in Massachusetts. Mayor Fitzgerald said I could count on Mr. Walsh. That was some time ago.

As I started to say, I had important men in both the Democratic and Republican Parties spend from one to two weeks' time investigating the business connected with this work. A detailed explanation of them would perhaps take more time than you care to go into this morning, but that you may know I have given a great deal of study to this subject I mention this careful investigation. I emphasize this point because my plans have been called impractical and impossible of realization—especially have they been called impractical by those who have wished to and sometimes succeeded in financing these same ideas in organizations of their own after convincing others that I ought not to have support. Very especially this has been the case where the critic wanted it to seem that the Government must do this great work.

Moreover, they have been proved practicable; that is, each step in the plans has been proved, and for that reason you may feel that my criticism of the Mondell bill is entirely a friendly criticism; that I want this movement for soldiers on the land to succeed. I introduced the first bill in the Congress for putting them on the land immediately after war was declared. Senator Curtis introduced a bill in the Senate for me. I also want to say that I am a western woman; that I believe in reclamation; that I hope soon to live again in the West and die there when my time comes—

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you will live there but hope you will not die there.

Mrs. LUND. That is nice of you; I do not want to decamp immediately. I feel we have gone about this whole matter of soldier settlement wrong end to, and there is not a man on this committee who is in the slightest degree responsible for that. I want to put the responsibility for our delay in taking hold of this measure at the proper time and in the proper manner exactly where it belongs, and I also want to be understood that in stating who is responsible

for this delay I do it with a full appreciation that these people might very well have thought as you and I think that our plans are the best plans. I believe that everyone should have his hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mrs. Lund, so that we may keep the record clear. You spoke of your bill introduced by Senator Curtis. Is that Senate 2696, introduced by Senator Curtis, by request, July 24, 1917?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; creating a board of administration, and after we used that word "administration" it was decided at a caucus of five or six Republican Senators, held in Senator Weeks's office, that they would change the word "administration" in committee and make it a commission appointed by Congress to develop a practicable standard for rural colonies and to establish the same for dependent families of soldiers of the United States and to make a national colonization survey. We felt that a commission to study these matters should be established, that we might be ready for the soldiers when they returned. Other countries appointed a commission as soon as war began, and we could read into our record here with great advantage to ourselves the British findings from their study, because they put experts on their commission of many shades of opinion and studied it thoroughly from all angles. And that is what we wanted to bring about in this Curtis bill. We planned to have this vast subject studied.

Mr. WHITE. What is the number of that bill?

Mrs. LUND. S. 2696. We planned after the study of this subject in all of its ramifications to bring out through the hearings on the bill all the salient facts so the public would be informed through publicity. I planned to call experts on the different things that make up this great big problem of colonization not alone for the information to the committee, but to inform the people. I went to the magazine editors and to all the newspaper syndicates and arranged for them to carry these hearings. The subject is very little understood. We stumble so over words. Many do not know what the word "socialism" is in contradistinction to "State socialism," nor what "communities" means in contradistinction to "communism and socialism and cooperation." There are many words that bother us, and it was my idea to have people of national consequence whose opinion could not be gainsaid in their own special field define these things in no uncertain terms, so we might all know about them, then let the legislation grow out of this comprehension and have the legislation prepared in time to be ready when the boys get home.

I have had a very peculiar experience with the State socialists in the present administration, and may I define here what I consider the difference between State socialism and socialism, and I will say my authority for the definitions is Karl Marx, Ferdinand Lassalle and William English Walling, all socialists, and I think considered authorities on socialism. The socialist wants all of the property in the world and all of the tools and equipment owned evenly, divided evenly, and managed by the people themselves. The State socialist—and Bismarck evolved State socialism, and the first State socialism began in Germany—wants the Government to engage in business, especially in financing business enterprise. Bismarck was a wily old gentleman and saw that the cooperationists were getting away from him. He had persecuted them for twenty-odd years

and they continued to grow, and he saw that the really democratic, cooperative organization throughout Germany threatened their militaristic régime, so he then started to finance them. He could not kill them out, so he said, "We will buy them; we will give them all the money they want from the public treasury," and that is where our State socialism began. For many years we have admired Germany, and before the war who did not admire Germany, especially all the people sympathetic with the underdog thought that Germany was most efficient and had worked out plans that had done away with poverty, and we were all copying her.

Col. Roosevelt was the Kaiser's friend, and many of his progressive ideas were admittedly borrowed from Germany; but Col. Roosevelt was among the first to see the peril when the real nature of the State control showed itself during the war. He started to lead his progressives (who sometimes did not take time to see where they were progressing, so intent were they upon altering things they thought wrong) to see that they were leaping from the frying pan into the fire and that you can not change human nature through legislation.

When private capital gouged and cheated we thought to stop gouging and cheating by taking the business away from them and letting the Government do it unmindful of the fact since illustrated that we may wake up to find the same men running the Government bureau who were running the private enterprise and with no responsibility or capital involved. If individuals want to cheat and waste, they will, no matter what the form of government or of business organization. We simply have to prove that it does not pay to do it. I mean pay in dollars and cents.

Capital faces the issue squarely and has for years, though it would not recognize the fact that unless it (capital) gave a fair deal to the world and arranged easy credit and opportunity for housing, farm settlement, farm mortgage, labor conditions, etc., a dissatisfied people would get up and take it one way or the other. The angle of Bolshevik development in this country we need to fear is not the violent lower strata who read their own primitive nature of direct action into the formula that the college man and parlor agitator read into action on their own plane. The formula is the same. Take business out of the hands of private enterprise and let the Government do it. Each wants to be the Government that does it, and each destroys democracy by so doing. It makes no difference whether it is the capitalist class that grasps all the power and refuses representation to the other class or the I. W. W. class. The danger to representative government is the same. We are in danger of alienating our aliens by putting all blame on them. Better look to our intellectuals who seek to overthrow democracy by the ballot.

Prior to the war most of the reformers and church people who wanted to make things better in our country looked upon Germany as their model. In their present repudiation of things German they have not, unfortunately, stopped to remember their previous attachment for German ideals which have made part of their own program. They have forgotten. I want them to remember.

I wish to be understood as appreciating the sincere purpose of the individuals who are clamoring for State socialism, but I must point out the dangers I see through their organized effort. Much

of this organization is so subtly distributed and much of it is under the guise of church work, welfare, and educational organizations.

Now, our first great departure from the American idea was in the rural credit bill. I believe—in fact, I know—it was fostered in the beginning in this country directly by those interested through Germany: we have since found out Germany has been undermining everything pertaining to an individual, democratic form of government for years, because they saw that just as far as you could get the Government interested in going into business and establishing bureaus, was it easy to control politically. Where we saw the beginning of it was when the American commission went abroad under the auspices of the Southern Commercial Congress.

Mr. Taft appointed the first commission to investigate rural credit at the suggestion of Mr. Herrick and Ralph Ingalls, and Mr. Herrick tells me he got his first idea of agricultural credit sitting at a banquet next to Kaiser Wilhelm, who asked him what he did for agricultural credit in this country. That question set a group of bankers here studying better forms of agricultural credit. They had not gone very far in that study before they found that the man who started the very cooperation that Germany was remarkable for was a man named Carey, over here in Philadelphia, and that what was then known in Germany as the *landwirtschaft*, and the whole German idea of taking care of all this agricultural credit and of colonization through State aid was Bismarck's buying up, you might say, the opposition or pure cooperation and financing it from the State treasuries so he could control it, and that is the thing that fooled us. This hurried report of the American commission that studied three months to investigate. Mr. Herrick took the position that we should follow along the lines of pure cooperation, not State aid, and was trying to get the bankers in this country to see that they must establish long-term mortgages with better forms of credit and interest and cooperation. But the Democratic régime came in, and, unfortunately, the men who carried on the work in the Southern Commercial Congress in sending the American commission abroad saw only—well, they were only over there three months, and did not have as much time to spend investigating as Mr. Herrick's people, who stayed there four years; but these people in three months saw the surface things being done and saw all these different governments doing things for agricultural credit and colonization.

Now, when they saw that, they came back here, and you all know the story of the Federal farm loan act which was evolved out of that. Now, all of this time those people who were concerned in this idea of world domination were trying, through the governments of all countries, to make us see that the German ideal of government was the right ideal, and that for the Government to do it all and go into all lines of business, giving them control through all these bureaus, simply made it easier for them to control things from Berlin. There is not time to go into all I know on that subject, but it is a great, big subject, gentlemen; if you follow it down, you will find that investigation will prove my statement.

Now, if the hearings on the Curtis bill had gone ahead this whole matter would have been cleaned up. I took great pains to make the matter bipartisan in all the publicity that was sent out, and I put

Senator Sheppard's picture right next to Senator Curtis, and put Dr. Carver, of Harvard, on the page with them; and I was not manifested in the publicity. I talked with the Senators on the Senate Agricultural Committee and told them I would send out stories for each one of their statements. I was going to use the Senators on that committee because of their prominence to carry the message to the people as to what we were trying to work out, so the people would understand what we were trying to do, and all were agreed to it. Senator Gore was very much my friend on the whole matter, and, finally, one day, after the hearings were set—

The CHAIRMAN. You prepared the publicity, you say?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; I helped to prepare it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this one of the articles in *Sea Power* of April, 1919?

Mrs. LUND. It is one of the articles which Senator Harding made up from data which I gave him.

The CHAIRMAN. You furnished the information in it?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you prepare the article?

Mrs. LUND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator himself?

Mrs. LUND. The Senator prepared it from some of the material I gave him.

Mr. ELSTON. Is that the Senator Harding article?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; entitled, "Rooting Valor in American Soil," by Senator Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, in the *Sea Power* for April, 1919.

Mrs. LUND. I went to Senator Gore's office and asked his secretary if the hearings would begin on the day they were set, and his secretary, who knew me very well, said, "Well, Fred Howe has been over here and wants them postponed." That was Frederick Howe, the immigration commissioner at Ellis Island. He has been a member of my own board and he has never yet resigned from it, yet he has worked against me all of the time on this proposition, because Mr. Howe believes the Government should do it all, and I showed how the Government did not need to do it, how credit could be mobilized in the communities.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is this Mr. Howe?

Mrs. LUND. Frederick Howe, the commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, in the Labor Department. He is an appointee of Louis Post. Mr. Howe had been over before the committee and had asked them to postpone the hearings on the bill; evidently he did not want hearings on the bill. That was as much as the secretary told me. I walked over to see Senator Gore and Senator Gore was all fussed up. He said, "Mrs. Lund, I am not going to have these hearings." "Well," I said, "what is the matter?" "Well," he said, "I have been told it is nothing on earth but a demagogic move on the part of the Republicans to secure the soldier vote." He did not mention Mr. Howe.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in reference to a hearing on Senate 2686?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; that was a hearing he had already arranged for and was just as much pleased about as anybody. I said, "You know

I have kept this thing bipartisan." He said, "I know you have, and you are all right." "Well," I said, "You know how hard I tried to work with the administration, and you know, Senator Gore, that you were just as mad about it as I to think that the Socialists in the Labor Department ditched us, and we could not go on with our plans." He said, "I know I was, and they treated you rough, but I don't know about this hearing." He said, "The other fellows—the Republicans—will take advantage of it if you don't. I know that you do not care about the Republicans or the Democrats, but the Republicans will be glad to get this over on us." I do not remember the exact words, but that is the gist. Now, gentlemen, the hearings were never called. Benjamin Marsh was also a caller at the committee who tried to keep this hearing from going on. They were not held at all. Later Senator Weeks put in a bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did Marsh try to keep them from going on?

Mrs. LUND. I inferred that. I was not told so. I was not told who said these things, but I know what Marsh always says when he talks about this work.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is that the same Marsh who appeared before this committee the other day?

Mrs. LUND. Ben Marsh. I suppose so; he appears before almost every committee.

Mr. WHITE. Did I understand you to say that Howe, commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, is an appointee of Louis Post?

Mrs. LUND. Yes. He is a friend of Louis Post and he selected him. I suppose Secretary Wilson appointed him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Post would not be in position to appoint him himself, would he?

Mrs. LUND. No; except, as you know, Secretary Wilson when Mr. Post first came there—I do not know how it is now—leaned very heavily upon Mr. Post. I spent a great deal of time in the department, and the department took up my plans at one time and read from them verbatim in reports to the Secretary, and Mr. Post came out with statements to the press, which I still have, saying they were going to cooperate with me.

The CHAIRMAN. What department took up your plan?

Mrs. LUND. The Department of Labor, the first year of the Wilson administration, and pretty nearly the first month of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they represented in the Crosser bill?

Mrs. LUND. They took all of my plans exactly as I outlined them, the magnificent coordination which I had worked out for Bureau of Immigration use in the night schools, so as to educate these immigrants into better citizenry and to put those that belonged on the land where they could get on the land, and link it up with various chambers of commerce so that those who belonged in industry would go there, and we would have a sort of interlocking bureau of information about the matter. That was all put in under the head of "Americanization," all of my educational plans, and all of the plans that were outlined in the Crosser bill were my colonization plans, with this difference, Mr. Chairman, that they wanted the Government to do it all, and I said that it should be done outside the Government with the Government cooperating; that the Government should set the standard, should regulate, should assist business men to understand how they could mobilize the credit in the local com-

munities through cooperation, so that it might become an actual long-term credit to the would-be settler who had very small means; and that the standard that should be set should be a standard so that people who did not understand farming could have instruction and could have the proper kind of rural schools and social life in the communities, because the reason people leave the farms is because they fail to find that social life they want and fail in general prosperity. This is bound to be true when the individual small farmer attempts by himself to meet this vast disorganized marketing system which is ours.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, I do not like to interrupt you, but I should like to get the matter developed in a logical sequence. Are you familiar with the Kelly bill, supported by the Department of Labor?

Mrs. LUND. No; I do not know the Kelly bill. The Crosser bill is the first one I know, except the building and loan bill and the housing bills.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Kelly bill supplanted the Crosser bill and has been supported by Mr. Post, who appeared before the committee last year in support of the Kelly bill.

Mrs. LUND. I missed the Kelly bill. I had such a hectic experience regarding the Crosser bill I am sure you gentlemen will pardon me for thinking that the administration is interested in keeping me away from committees.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who do you mean by the administration?

Mrs. LUND. Well, that is a broad word. I should say the Socialists in the administration. That would be the best way to define it.

Mr. ELSTON. Does that include President Wilson and Mr. Tumulty?

Mrs. LUND. I do not think President Wilson knows anything about it. I know that Col. House was very much interested in the plan. I had a letter of introduction to Col. House from Senator Sheppard, and Col. House said, "I like your plan very much. I think we ought to take that up, but it is reconstruction work. Why don't you take it up with Secretary Wilson?" I said, "Thereby hangs a tale," and I told him about my experience in that department, in the Southern Commercial Congress and Southern Settlement Development and that there was a very great difference of opinion among the men. They believed that the people-getting agency is entitled to a profit on the land and whatever business they handle, and I believe that a people-getting agency should be organized not to sell land and not to make a profit. Col. House said, "You are right, and I am going to help you. I will speak to Secretary Wilson," but, as you know, he has since then been a very busy man. Later he wrote me he could do nothing about it.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask you one question for my own information? Is this Louis Post you refer to the Louis F. Post that wrote a very illuminating book, as he supposed, probably, on the subject of single taxation, taking up the Henry George theory?

Mrs. LUND. He is the editor of *The Public*, and an ardent single taxer, and in the last few years has become a State Socialist. Mrs. Post has been a Socialist for a long time, but I understand Mr. Post did not come over to the fold until recently. When I first talked with

him he said one of the things he liked about my plans was that they were wholly democratic without being too paternal, and that they were not socialistic, and did not make the Government do things, but afterwards he evidently changed his mind, because he dropped this plan and took up the other. I want to make clear to you what the Committee on Labor did on the hearings on the Crosser bill. I asked the committee to hear Carl S. Vrooman, then Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; Dr. Thomas N. Carver, of Harvard, who certainly is a national figure on this subject.

Mr. WHITE. Who published a book on "social justice."

Mrs. LUND. Yes; and his book on "rural economics" is a textbook in all our agricultural colleges, and he organized the work in the Department of Agriculture which is being carried on all over our country—the whole system of rural organization he outlined in his book on rural economics—I asked them to hear him. I asked them to hear Leonard G. Robinson, who was for 11 years manager of the Jewish agricultural society, and who has had more experience in this settlement work than, perhaps, anyone else; and then I asked them to hear Mrs. Lund, who has been trying to bring these people together. They would not call any of those men and they would not call me. Finally when, through the influence of several Republicans, I got a hearing there was no quorum present that morning. There were two people who came in, and they adjourned; and they said they would not call it up again, but I could send in anything I wanted to have printed in the record; and it stopped there. I did not send my statement. And I had the same experience, as I have told you, on the Curtis bill; and when the Weeks bill came along, which provided for a concurrent resolution establishing a commission to get ready to do the thing—not hurriedly but wisely—that, too, was buried in committee, and you could not get it out of committee by any possibility; so we are now not ready for farm settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Weeks resolution, to which you refer, is that Senate concurrent resolution No. 21?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; Senate concurrent resolution 21, September 27, 1918.

Mr. ELSTON. Mrs. Lund, I came to the hearing this morning a little late. Are you going into your theory and what you believe to be the proper method to handle this subject?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; I should be very glad to go into that.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it strictly a colonization proposition and not what they call an infiltration method?

Mrs. LUND. Mine is a strictly colonization method, including industrial housing with garden plots—the so-called garden city idea; small tracts of land for people to live on when they work in factories, using that garden plot to augment their wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, Senate resolution No. 21 refers to a great many other subjects.

Mrs. LUND. Yes; the soldier settlement bill is down toward the bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. And includes almost everything within the range of our war and peace activities.

Mrs. LUND. Yes; it was to be a reconstruction measure, and, of course, reconstruction means a great many things.

The CHAIRMAN. And it was not devoted solely to this soldier settlement plan?

Mrs. LUND. Oh, no; No. 16 refers to the allotment of lands to returned soldiers and sailors, and their establishment in homes on the public domain. Now, it might interest you to know that Senator Weeks was willing to finance a colony in——

The CHAIRMAN. When you refer to No. 16, you mean line 16, on page 4.

Mrs. LUND. Yes; that is what I mean.

The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to get that straight in the record.

Mrs. LUND. I am glad that you call me back, because I have just passed through a siege of sickness and have been in the hospital two or three times suffering from nervous prostration. My doctor has told me that I should be in a sanitarium now. One thing I have lost on account of this long strain is my memory, and it is sometimes difficult for me to pick up the thread of what I have said. I am only about 50 per cent efficient now, because I am in need of rest and should have relief from strain resulting from what I have been going through with, caused by repeated interference with my plans.

The CHAIRMAN. You said that the Curtis bill was prepared by you?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the Weeks resolution prepared by you?

Mrs. LUND. No, sir. Senator Weeks said that it ought to be a part of the policy of the Republican Party to show the capitalists of this country generally that there must be a different method of financing and housing farms, otherwise, we must expect the Government to do it. In other words, we must have an adjustment of credit facilities to extend this sort of aid to home purchasing, just as we have to alter credit facilities to South American conditions. If we go into South America and do any business, we must give long-time credit. I have spent a great deal of time with the so-called conservative group, because, as I have said, the others do not need converting to the idea. The conservatives have not thought the plans of reformers practical and so have not advocated them. I wanted to gain their indorsement, because, if they approve, capitalists will finance the plans. A bank president once told me that bankers wanted to help as much as any, only reformers always brought some plan that would not work and so nothing was accomplished, that remark set me thinking, and the result is now indorsed by many bankers. I wanted to show them the sound finance of this thing that we call cooperation. In that endeavor, I was very fortunate in having such men as Myron T. Herrick and Mr. Ingalls to back up what I said about cooperation. Their book, Rural Credit, tells all about cooperation. They studied six years, and their expenditures have been something like \$60,000, I believe. At any rate, these gentlemen, Senators Wadsworth, Smoot, and Weeks, and others I have mentioned, were prepared to help with information before the committee hearing the Curtis bill, and they have given me permission in magazine articles and news articles to say that they believe that the financiers of this country must concern themselves with financing the development of such natural resources as require long-term investments and low rates of interest and land settlement and housing

on long terms and at low rates of interest, and they are prepared to help the financial world to understand how that can be done without any departure from what they understand as sound economics.

It may mean something to you when I say that Mr. George E. Roberts, of the National City Bank, took considerable time investigating these different details, and he has told me that he would pass out statements to the financial journals over his desk in order to help the financiers to see this need. He will do that because he is deeply interested in this matter of land settlement, and he wanted very much to have Mr. Vanderlip interested in it as soon as he returned. That answers the question, I think, that perhaps may be in your minds as to why I selected for the work that I have in mind those men who have not usually been associated in the public mind with so-called progressive ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean Senator Weeks and Senator Harding?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; and Senator Wadsworth, Senator Smoot, Senator Fernald, and Senator Watson.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Senator Weeks helping to finance your plan?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; Senator Weeks has given a good deal of money to it.

The CHAIRMAN. He has given a good deal of money to it?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; and he has recently subscribed \$5,000 to our fund of \$100,000 to carry on this work. I was with Col. Robert Bacon only a week before he died, and he said that he would give a dinner to the capitalists, which Senators Wadsworth and Weeks and others would attend, and at which they would advocate this plan to the capitalists. Then I had the news of his death from an operation the following week. Col. Bacon said there was no question about being able to raise money according to my plans.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Senator Wadsworth and Senator Harding subscribe?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; Senator Harding not Senator Wadsworth.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the others who have subscribed?

Mrs. LUND. Col. Robert M. Thompson, Senator Curtis, and others.

Mr. JOHNSON. How is this money used?

Mrs. LUND. I have a letter from Senator Weeks which you may see. Senator Weeks subscribed \$5,000 to be used when the other \$100,000 was secured.

Mr. BENHAM. You spoke of your board. Are we to understand that you selected anyone you wanted on your board without having first consulted with the people who were appointed?

Mrs. LUND. No, sir. We are a legal entity organized as a non-profit-making association under the laws of New Jersey. We did not have a committee on finance or a president for the reason that it took me a long time to make big-brained busy men see the importance of this work, and I knew that lesser minds could not carry it. Therefore I left the presidency and the finance committee vacant so that these big-brained men could have the officers and finance committee as they wished when they would be persuaded to take it. We have a committee on direction, composed of Col. Parker, of the Salvation Army, Dr. Carver, of Harvard, and five or six others. I have

the names here in a little booklet. The committee on direction is a sort of steering committee, and any name that I wanted to propose for this board was put up to the committee on direction and voted on at a regular meeting. I conducted my work for nearly a year at Fourteenth Street and Second Avenue in New York City, but I ought to tell you about my plan before I tell you that. This committee on direction meets and passes on any matter or names that are brought in and they determine what they will do. I have made no attempt to get up a membership or to go out and raise money, except as this aid has been offered to me to help me to conduct the work until we could get credit mobilized and interested enough to take it up and to see that this matter of land colonization and housing must be financed at a low rate of interest to the people. That work, as I say, because of the death of Col. Bacon, is still waiting.

Mr. JOHNSON. You stated a moment ago that Senator Weeks and Senator Harding had contributed to this fund, and I want to know how that money is used.

Mrs. LUND. They are contributions in one sense of the word, and to make that clear I will read a letter from Senator Weeks to our treasurer, Mr. Walter H. Fahy, of 34 Pine Street, New York City. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am glad to pledge \$5,000 to a fund, to be paid when the balance of \$100,000 has been subscribed, to be furnished to the Forward-to-the-Land League and to be used to hasten its work.

I think the plan is practical and American. It should make unused land productive, give homes and independence to those who want to possess them through their own efforts, and insure for this reason their prosperity. It will become a powerful factor in combating the spirit of disorder and rebellion typified by Bolshevism, and the curtailment of human freedom and progress which socialism seeks to impose.

The land league, nonprofit making but self-supporting, needs only to be understood to command the support of thinking, responsible people. It can contribute much to Americanization, to the development of a free and powerful people in accordance with the best traditions of our Government, while increasing our industrial and national wealth.

Therefore I regard my subscription as a contribution to our national well-being.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN W. WEEKS.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that letter?

Mrs. LUND. May 21, 1919.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much did Senator Harding contribute to this fund?

Mrs. LUND. Senator Harding and a number of gentlemen contributed smaller amounts of money from time to time. Three or four of them made contributions simply to cover my living expenses while I was working. Because there are State Socialists in both parties, people who think that the Government should do all these things, it has been difficult to handle my work.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you represent the Socialists?

Mrs. LUND. No, sir; I do not represent the Socialists. How could you get any such idea?

Mr. JOHNSON. I am simply asking that for information. I am trying to learn.

Mrs. LUND. I have been trying to make it clear that they are the people who have been antagonizing me all the time. I want to

make it clear that it is not at all partisan, because there are many people in the Republican Party who believe that way, as well as in the Democratic Party. The Socialists in the Republican Party work quite closely with the Socialists in the Democratic Party in their efforts to have the Government to do these things. They would like to create a condition where each farm would be a Government farm; they would pass this bill and that bill, and bills covering a thousand different things until we would have a million bureaus operating, and the Government converted into a bureaucracy. I do not think we should have that without fighting against it.

It would simplify matters if all these State Socialists would get a party of their own.

Mr. MAYS. You said that Senator Weeks thought the financiers should handle these undertakings?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir. Two years ago, when I first got Senator Weeks's attention, he called several Senators into his office and said to them, "This is a thing that is very important, because, as Mrs. Lund has pointed out, this radical wave is gathering impetus, and the only way to meet it is by showing that the capitalists of this country are concerned with their economic well-being, and this matter of assisting people to proper homes is economically sound and basic. It is a thing that we must give attention to." I said to him, "The thing to do is something that will show that capital is willing to do it; that it is willing to provide long terms for payment; that it is willing to provide community organization and instruction, and all at a low rate of interest. It is not enough to say that we are willing to do it, but actually to do it is the important thing." He said, "I should like very much to do that myself up in Massachusetts." He said, "I want a colony up there. There are some of my friends who will go in with me, and we will get something ready for the soldiers when they come back from Europe." He then said, "You go and see Charlie Hatfield, and he will help you." Well, I did go to Boston to see Mr. Hatfield; and I found Mr. Hatfield like a great many other bankers who have the idea that things are very well as they are. There are a half a dozen bankers, perhaps, who see we must do something; the rest are so busy adding up figures that I do not get their attention long enough to interest them.

Mr. Hatfield said, "Yes; I will attend to that right away"; but he never did. Senator Weeks is a very busy man. I spoke to him about it two or three times, and he said, "I will write to Charley Hatfield about it." At the end of the session, or when Congress adjourned this year, I said to Senator Weeks in regard to this Massachusetts movement to help the returning soldiers, "There is no time now to reach the soldiers or to take care of them in the regular way, but if we rush we can take care of most of the unemployed soldiers in vacation gardens. We may take care of the work in that way this year and get ready by fall for the permanent housing." He said, "How can you do it?" I said, "We will provide barracks and tents and make a vacation proposition of it until we can build permanently." He said, "Run up to Boston and see what can be done while I am down in Florida. I am going to Florida, and then I will come up there and see what can be done about it." This was to be according to the standard of the Forward to Land League—on long-term credit,

with 6 per cent profit on the undertaking. When I called on Mr. Hatfield on the second trip he was very helpful and regretted that he had not taken it up before.

The CHAIRMAN. Six per cent profit for whom?

Mrs. LUND. For the men who buy and equip the land.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean the promoter?

Mrs. LUND. As I was the promoter and did not get anything, I guess the promoter does not get anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean 6 per cent profit for those who finance it?

Mrs. LUND. For those who finance it. That is an important point—that you can not have anything of lasting consequence in this world if it can not pay expenses and pay enough profit to keep business men willing to devote time to it, knowing that it is a good business investment. It would have been a perfectly simple thing to induce philanthropists to take it up on a charitable basis. They would finance it without any thought of profit, but that would not help the problem at all.

I prefer the method that was used 30 years ago in England, when philanthropists and the public-spirited people were so alarmed about the social conditions and about the crime and bad health incident to the bad housing conditions. They organized garden cities and established suburban housing and garden plots, and they established many small farms on the basis of 6 per cent profit to those who financed the undertakings.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you consider Senator Harding as one of the financiers of this project?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; Senator Harding is interested.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does he want 6 per cent profit?

Mrs. LUND. He did not say anything about profits, one way or the other. He was interested in marking the argument to show business men that it could be done. I think Senator Harding would be called a contributor to working fund bearing no profit. I am firmly set against charity. We do not need charity for our people, whether soldiers or working people. Anybody that starts out to do anything on the basis of charity sets us back. Charity interferes very materially with true progress along these lines.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe that small profit to the promoter or financier is necessary to the success of the project?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; so that they will stay in it and pay attention to it. We need strong men to run these things. We require the best brains in the country to carry on such undertakings, and you can not get the best brains to engage in business continuously unless it is profitable. The bread-and-butter problem is always with you, and we want to show business men how they can do these things profitably and right.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not your understanding that Senator Weeks was to raise \$100,000?

Mrs. LUND. He had nothing to do with the \$100,000, except to help start the subscription. His letter shows that he subscribed \$5,000 to be paid when the balance of the fund of \$100,000 had been subscribed. Other money he gave was a contribution to a working fund, and there was no profit expected on that fund at any time. That contribution is to the fund to carry on the educational propaganda that we need.

Mr. SMITH. I do not understand why you fail to realize that there are plenty of opportunities in this country, and places to be improved in the West and other parts of the country that the Government might take up, and at the same time let your plan be applied in other sections of the country. There is plenty of room for both.

Mrs. LUND. There is no question about that.

Mr. SMITH. You do not need any legislation to carry out your plan.

Mrs. LUND. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Are you antagonizing the plan proposed in the bill that is pending before the committee?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. For what reason?

Mrs. LUND. In the first place—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). If there is plenty of room in the country for both plans, I do not see why you would be concerned.

Mrs. LUND. In the first place, we are facing a situation in which the Government needs every cent that it can get, and the purchasing power of the dollar is less than it ever was before. We have more than one and a half million acres of land already connected with our irrigation projects, 1,641,699 acres to be exact—that is, land that is under water and can be used. Then we have something like 500,000,000 acres of unused agricultural land all over the country. We have plenty of it even in Indiana, Ohio, and some of those States not supposed to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to say there are waste lands in Indiana?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; there is some waste land in Indiana. I have not made a personal investigation of it, but the reclamation people who have investigated it, have told me so.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if the lady does not require legislation in order to carry out her plan, I think she should devote her attention to the bill that is pending before the committee. Mrs. Lund, I think you are making a splendid statement and are contributing a lot of information to the committee, but we have a concrete proposition here, and if you do not need any legislation to carry out your plan, we are not concerned with it. Why not tell us wherein we are in error with regard to this bill pending before the committee?

Mrs. LUND. I will be glad to do it, but other questions were asked me first.

Mr. WHITE. Do you confidently believe that for that profit capital could be induced to finance this situation in order to meet the present exigency?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; and I will say that I have been assured that there was no question whatever but what we would get all the money we wanted.

Mr. WHITE. Will you state to the committee approximately how much you think it would require to meet the exigencies as they arise during the next three or four years?

Mrs. LUND. Well, will that be confined to the matter of the returning soldiers?

Mr. WHITE. I said the exigency.

Mrs. LUND. Do you mean the soldiers that are registered?

Mr. WHITE. I would not use the word "registered," because I do not pass any judgment on that.

Mrs. LUND. No, sir; but do you mean the registered men who want farms?

Mr. WHITE. Those that might want to farm.

Mrs. LUND. I understand that they have a lineup on them in the Reclamation Bureau. Let us talk about them. Someone asked me a while ago what was my plan, and where it may be carried out. When you say, "your plan," I think, perhaps, you mean to refer to my method of mobilizing capital and showing capital how this can be done. In the first place, you are familiar with the land business, and you know that the chief expense connected with it is in getting the people to the land. The chief expenses in connection is advertising, the hire of automobiles, salesmanship, etc. Then, the people who are placed on the land do not stay put.

For every three or four placed on the farm, there is only one who stays and finishes the thing up as a farmer. That is a matter of history and statistics. Now, I devised this Bureau of Information idea, and it is, perhaps, the only thing that is really original in my plan, because thousands of people have devised plans for communities and have organized communities. If we were to have in every principal city bureaus of land information, where it would be understood there was no land for sale, but where a man who wanted to buy land could come and have a tract of land looked up to find out whether the title was right, or whether the contracts were honest contracts, whether the prospective farmer had capital enough, and, generally, where he could get information as to how he should proceed with his farm operations, it would be a valuable thing. I have lived in the West long enough to know that much money is squandered because there is no direction. I know practically all of the big land operators in the West and the colonization men who are connected with the railroads, and they tell me that our people waste every year almost enough to keep themselves going because they do not know how to direct their purchasing power. If we could have bureaus of information established in all of the principal cities, and have the extension departments from the agricultural colleges come into the cities to teach classes in agriculture and home economics and rural economics, it would be a great blessing to the working people. In other words, if we could bring to the prospective farmer and instruct him—as we instruct the man actually farming—

Mr. WHITE (interposing). Would you teach the housekeepers, or mothers, or the children?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; the mothers, and especially the children.

Mr. WHITE. I want to ask another question: Don't you think that the mothers have the art of housekeeping down pretty fine, generally?

Mrs. LUND. If you were in the East Side of New York, where I have been, you would not think so.

Mr. WHITE. I am talking about the West.

Mrs. LUND. No, sir.

Mr. WHITE. I am not speaking of the cities.

Mrs. LUND. I am speaking now of the cities.

Mr. WHITE. You are speaking of the large cities?

Mrs. LUND. I confess that my mind right now is mostly on the large cities. I am thinking more of the industrial mother.

Mr. WHITE. I do not want to divert your attention from your main statement.

Mrs. LUND. That is an important question, because I know that there are housekeepers through the West who really do not know how to feed their families and do not know how to prepare the most simple food. We have too many frills on the domestic science idea—

The CHAIRMAN. If you will allow me to interrupt you, in this article by Senator Harding, of Ohio, in the April number of Sea Power, is that statement, and I think you could give us some valuable information in regard to this:

Somewhat strangely, the torch that burns brightest in these dark cellars of America though where land policies languish is that which has been held aloft by a woman. Mrs. Haviland H. Lund developed her theories of getting people on the land, when a decade ago she edited, in Los Angeles, a publication known as Little Farms Magazine. Upon her theories was built the Forward-to-the-Land League, a national organization. To her the proper solution of the land problem has been a Holy Grail which she has pursued ever since. She has preached her gospel from door to door, from office to office.

From this it appears that you have been working on this question for 10 years.

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you inaugurated any projects in that 10 years?

Mrs. LUND. I am glad you asked that question, but may I finish my other statement before I answer it?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mrs. LUND. By bringing these extension workers into the cities, and by the formation of night classes, they can teach these prospective farmers what to do on the land, and it has this effect, that instead of having to do as a land company has to do, that is, advertise in order to get the lands before the people at great expense, the people in the cities seeing the announcement in all of the daily papers that Prof. So-and-so will teach these classes at night, those who are rurally-minded come from all parts of the city to hear him. They register on cards that I have made out, that gives full information as to the number of working members in the family, the amount of education and capital they have, what their religion is, and such other information as would be useful. These people would be classified, and this matter of classifying, as every practical colonization man knows, is, perhaps, the crux of the problem. The immigration leaders and labor leaders all said that there was no question but that through registration we could get the people who were frightened because of the exploitation that had been theirs at the hands of commercial colonization men would have confidence in us. The religious element is an important one, because it has been the history of these movements that the colonies that have accomplished anything worthwhile have had some sort of religious tie that held them together. Therefore, I would take these matters up with the religious organizations, and get them to put rural education or agriculture in their missionary instructions, so that the clergymen or missionaries would have practical knowledge of farming so that they could advise and

instruct those in their parish. That religious principle is an important one.

We found that those people in the cities who registered, 75 per cent had had farming experience here or abroad. In other words, it illustrated forcibly that the deplorable exodus from the country to the city were the very ones wanting to get back to the farm. Our registrants wanted to go where they could live close together, and they demanded schools as good in the country as they had in the city. As you know, the rural schools are not as good as they ought to be.

I asked the newspapers to help me get this idea across to the people and explained there was no profit—they helped loyally, as my scrap-books testify. This publicity helped me interest commercial organizations because it showed them how we could get the people with far less cost.

I spoke to commercial organizations, such as chambers of commerce, bankers' associations, etc., and I said, "Now, gentlemen, you want settlers; you have been giving a lot of money to this organization and that organization to bring you people, and you say the money is wasted, and they have never brought you any settlers, or if they brought a few they did not stay," and I outlined to them this system of lectures and publicity which I had in the cities and showed them where I could go and get the people; but I said, "That is only on the condition that they have the tools to work with." I said, "You do not expect carpenters to build a house unless you give them the tools. If a man has had hard luck and has pawned his tools, you would expect to put up the money to get those tools for him before he built the house, and you would expect to deduct the advanced money from his wages. Farming requires a good deal in the way of tools.

A man can not live on a farm unless he has a house and a few chickens and pigs and farming implements and seeds, and things of that sort, and those things have to be supplied. They can put the little money they have on the first payment, and if you standardize this and say we will take at least 50 families that grouping of 50 or 100 families insures you a sufficient number of settlers so that the overhead of furnishing that group of settlers scientific direction is a business proposition. You can not afford a scientific director for 1 man or for 10 men, but if you are bringing 50 or 100 men you can afford to give them a special adviser and director to help them with their problems."

THE CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, how does Secretary Lane's plan differ from yours? Is not that what he is aiming at?

Mrs. LUND. Absolutely the same. They took my plan, and Mr. Newell, then director of reclamation, was on my board. Mr. Blanchard promised every possible help. We talked for weeks in Secretary Lane's department about these plans. There was, of course, the usual pull and haul as to whether it would be in the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture or Labor.

THE CHAIRMAN. The only difference between you—

Mrs. LUND. There is not a bit of difference.

THE CHAIRMAN (continuing). The only difference between you is this: You do not believe in the Government taking this up, but you believe it should be inaugurated as a private enterprise?

Mrs. LUND. Absolutely. I am not going to say a word about taxing everybody to take care of a certain class. That is true, but it makes no difference, in my argument. It is not necessary and I have proved that it is not necessary. You can get all the money you want in localities wanting settlers to do this work and do it in the right way without asking the Government for it. If you do put it under the Government, then it means this interminable building of bureaus and the political patronage that goes with it, and it makes no difference what party is in power you can not avoid that political patronage.

Mr. MAYS. Mrs. Lund, you have not answered the chairman's question as to how many projects you have started.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I read from this article where you had inaugurated this a decade ago, and I was wondering whether any projects had been started.

Mrs. LUND. No; I am coming to that. I am glad you called me back.

Mr. SMITH. Mrs. Lund, did you not say a moment ago that these plans were not in conflict at all, that the Government could go ahead with its plans and you could go ahead with your plan and that there was plenty of room for both?

Mrs. LUND. Surely. The only thing is people will not as readily enter into a private enterprise when they know the Government will do it all.

Mr. MAYS. They have been a little slow in putting your projects into operation.

Mrs. LUND. Yes; and whenever you put a plan before the people for regulating the abuses in a business which is full of flagrant abuses, and this fact the best men in the land admit, you meet with a great many obstacles. When you are only promising a man 6 per cent on his money and trying to show him that he must do this for national betterment, it is some time before you wake him up to the national necessity. The projects I had ready many times—and I have the correspondence to prove this—and they were in eight or ten different States—the business men were ready to extend this help. Just as we were ready would come letters and telegrams and visitors from the State Socialists in this administration and other Socialists working with them that are connected with the Republican Party and land organizations. Do not think there is anything partisan in this, because we have Gifford Pinchot and Francis Kellar working in various organizations; they believe just as much as Louis Post and Fred Howe that the Government ought to do it all, and they have been pulling with the administration on this on all these plans, while claiming to be Republicans, and they have interfered directly with my work in financing these colonies.

Mr. ELSTON. Mrs. Lund, you only have 20 minutes more in which to develop all your ideas, and I think we had better get down to something definite.

Mrs. LUND. The chairman asked me the question.

Mr. ELSTON. Can you not answer categorically the chairman's question as to how many experiments you have made and how many have been successful without explanation.

Mr. LUND. I can not without explanation.

Mr. ELSTON. Have you made any at all?

Mrs. LUND. No; because every time I have had them ready—and I can prove they have been ready—there has been this interference, and it might be considered of some importance to the Nation if anybody encouraging a plan which showed and proved that private capital was ready to finance the establishment of homes for the people was invariably interrupted by a certain group of people in the United States, a good many of them on the Government pay roll, and so kept from carrying out their plan.

Mr. ELSTON. Mrs. Lund, if you have been interrupted from time to time, what organization have you now that will take this thing up practically, will get it started in the next three months, will provide the hundreds of millions of dollars in a coordinated way to do this thing privately and practically and uniformly for the benefit of the soldiers? How do you think that can be done immediately and afford any relief and not be done 10 years hence, just as your past experience has shown it has not been done in the last 10 years? Can you answer that?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; I think I can.

Mr. ELSTON. What definite plans have you got to get the millions of dollars to work this out in a broad-gauged way from private capital? Have you that in hand?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Will you explain that to us without taking up too much time, because we are very quickly getting to the point where we will have to close this hearing.

Mrs. LUND. Don't you see, gentlemen, that if a certain group of people in power can go again and again and break up the work you are doing, when you have got people and money interested, and can throw a cloud over you—I do not know what they say, but again and again they say, "She has not done this, and evidently she can not do it." They do not explain that they have always been on the ground to say, "She is a dangerous woman." I do not know what they say about me, but I know that every time that anything is started the people backing me are scared away. I have an organization that can work in five minutes if it can be determined what is behind this interference and stop it. Now, I have so many important people with me that we can go anyway.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, Mrs. Lund, that is exactly the idea. Your point is, then, that if this bill which is now pending in the committee is not passed, then you and your organization, and principally through your own initiative, because it appears here from the testimony that you are the moving spirit in this whole thing, then through your organization and yourself, and your own energy and experience, you expect to raise the national organization of capital and the groups of private capitalists to carry this thing out.

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Within the next few months?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; I think it could be done inside of 90 days, all you can do with the Government.

Mr. ELSTON. What proposals have you in the way of getting the money which only await your word that this bill is defeated for them to come right in and pour out the money and go right ahead?

Mrs. LUND. I will answer that question in this way: You are familiar with the drives that have been made for getting money in different welfare organizations that have had no investment features, just simply to be helpful. A long time before anybody began to do it I said how this should be done in order to finance each unit or housing, and farm settlement, because it should all be done on the unit basis, I would organize what I call a rural colony foundation, a separate organization from the Forward-to-the-Land League, and limit the profits to 5 or 6 per cent or whatever the people when they got together should indicate was proper, and to make a drive for money in the communities wanting settlers. If the principal cities in the State of Indiana or Ohio organized a colonization company, with limited profits at 6 per cent, to operate on a certain tract of land in that State, and would make a stock company with the stock at \$10 a share, so that everybody in the community could buy it, everyone would want to help get farms for the soldiers.

When congestion in European cities became intolerable, when the health and efficiency of working men were threatened, public-spirited philanthropists solved the problem 30 years ago by the purchase of agricultural land near by large cities. They limited their profit in the equipment and resale of those lands and called them garden cities. They paid an unfailing dividend.

Not only is congestion in America becoming a menace, but the discontent of our people, because of unemployment and sordid living conditions, with scant opportunity for advancement, threatens the very foundations of society. During the war wages were high and the munition camps and factories were besieged with land agents whose only thought was to get as big a first payment as possible. We should safeguard this home-purchasing power now that the hour of peace has come, the many prosperous working people find themselves unemployed, we should place those fitted in rural colonies.

Is it not time for us to follow the example of European countries and create garden homes for our working people within easy distance of their city jobs, and farms for those fitted for purely agricultural pursuits?

A home garden gives the family most of its living from the garden and thus enables the workingman to bank most of his wages. The improvement in the living conditions of the family is even more important. "It is the divine right of every child to be reared in a garden."

Those who have left the country for the city frequently wish to return to farm life, and will do so, providing they can live in village communities where schools and social opportunities are available. They will not tolerate the lonely farm.

A large percentage of immigrants now here have had agricultural training, and prefer living on farms. Almost invariably they resent the individual farm, but will live in communities, as they do in Europe.

We have had no very complete survey of rural conditions as yet, but what has been discovered of causes undermining our rural life reveal two reasons for these conditions: Poor marketing facilities and lack of educational opportunity.

If farm life is a failure under present conditions, why not make conditions what they should be, since the life of democracy depends upon the upbuilding of rural America?

The British Government made an exhaustive study of this subject, and is determined that all rural communities shall be equipped with proper housing, the social amenities, and an agricultural instructor. They have voted funds to teach people cooperation, recognizing that as the basis of all home making and thrift.

No program for national defense is practical that does not include the settlement of our vacant agricultural land upon business principles.

Agriculture has been called our one unorganized business; it is susceptible of organization.

The land business needs regulation, as surely did the grain business before the honest grain dealers organized to exclude the bucket-shop man.

Mrs. LUND. The National Forward to the Land League advises the establishment of a rural colony foundation, its funds to be administered by such a board as directs the affairs of the General Education Board of the Rockefeller bequests. This foundation should articulate with the bureau of land information of the Forward to the Land League, and the officers and directors of the league should be numbered among the trustees of the rural colony foundation. We advise that this foundation, instead of being wholly financed by individual philanthropists, be subscribed to by them and the subscription list thrown open to the general public in a truly democratic way. Many want to help solve this national problem.

The hearts of our people have been stirred by the war and by the suffering from unemployment. They will be glad, indeed, to respond to a campaign to put our own people on a self-supporting basis.

There will be ample security back of every dollar used by the foundation.

We advise that the board of trustees appoint a land committee for the selection of suitable tracts of land on which will be created rural colonies built according to the standard of the National Forward-to-the-Land League and garden cities for housing industrial workers.

The standard for the social amenities will be the same in the urban and rural communities. Both will have an agricultural instructor and will be under the general supervision of the National Forward-to-the-Land League.

There will be a separate fund for the two classes of development work; contributors may choose between them.

The rural colony foundation should have sums available for the purchase of land and such physical equipment as appertains to real estate.

There should be a loaning fund created for the purpose of financing cooperative banking associations organized and controlled of residents. Such funds to be reloaned by the cooperative bank thus organized to members thereof. Loans to be made only for the purchase of food, implements, stock, seed, fertilizers, etc. Such equipment calls for what is known as short-term credit.

The form of cooperative credit organization for this class of finance is recommended by Hon. Myron T. Herrick and R. Ingalls, in their book called *Rural Credit*, and by Leonard G. Robinson,

president of the Federal farm-loan bank, Springfield, Mass., and joint author with A. H. Ham, of the Sage Foundation, of the Credit Union Primer, and is known as the Raiffeison system of cooperative banking.

Beneficent investors should specify which division of work in the rural colony foundation they wish their funds to finance.

There will be a separate corporation for each fund; stock will be issued by each with a limited profit specified. Stock in this foundation can be recommended not alone because it finances a constructive method of helping the less fortunate to help themselves, but because it is a sound investment. Every share of stock will have behind it land that is being constantly improved.

Model city tenements and suburban homes have been financed here and abroad and have paid an unfailing dividend; how much more will model rural colonies and garden homes surely succeed, since they represent not alone a model dwelling but an income-producing plot of land as well.

This fund would be used to assist the local capitalists in making up the funds needed for the colony, 50-50 basis, perhaps more. The valuable thing is to have the local business men get enough of their own money in the colony to concern themselves with its management. If bankers or other contributors to the rural colony foundations funds know that local men are in it and will attend they will feel safe in investing.

Such a fund would cooperate with individuals and corporations ready to standardize their colony work as we indicate.

In one city I almost put the thing through before representatives of the Southern Commercial Congress and the Southern Settlement Development Co. came and stayed four days. The work went to pieces. How can one prove their plan with such interference? I had spoken to every commercial organization, the rotary club twice, and the commercial club, and all the churches and women's organizations, and all appointed committees to help put a colony in their back country. The church women and the club women were ready to help in the sale of stock at this limited profit as a community interest to get this thing across.

Mr. ELSTON. Do you think that this bill, if passed, will stay the success of your private scheme?

Mrs. LUND. No; I do not, except it would probably hold it back somewhat because a lot of people want quick money in their State. All these land interests and commercial colonization companies that have been working to defeat my work are boosting this Lane-Mondell bill because they know it is going to bring a torrent of money into their own States for development work. You know how everybody goes after money from Washington. You know that Mr. Lane did not try to pass his bill until he sent his people out into every one of your States and drummed up a lot of interest in it because your States and your constituents want that money, that easy money, coming back there for development. Of course, he did not try to pass the bill until he had done that.

Mr. ELSTON. And you can say with great confidence that whether this bill passes or not you think you will have started within 90 days a plan to cover this whole question adequately without the aid of this bill?

Mrs. LUND. If a bill was passed that would in any way show co-operation by the Government with what we are doing, we would get money in 90 days, but I would not attempt to say that in 90 days we could attempt to put any soldiers on the land if the Government was going to do it. What we would have to do then would be to work slowly by your side to show that under private initiative something could be done, and then reach out into the housing question, etc.

But, gentlemen, please believe me when I say I have refused too many opportunities to align my work with powerful interests and put me on a profitable and successful basis for me to be under any question as to my personal interest in this matter; it is the menace of State socialism I oppose, no matter what effect it has on giving farms to soldiers.

Mr. ELSTON. Oh, no one has suggested that.

Mrs. LUND. And I am going to say now that if this does not enter into the question, I could jump in and help on this Mondell bill. Why not? I do not know Mr. Mondell very well, but Senator Smoot has always been one of the best friends of my work and promised to go before the committee on the Curtis bill to tell what the Mormons have done in this matter. I would like nothing better than to help him, but this building up of bureaus and State socialism I am afraid of; I must oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, in this article by Senator Harding in Sea Power, referring to lands available, you say, "These are obtainable in all sections of the country, within 50 miles of New York, Cleveland, St. Louis, New Orleans, or Washington. There are 30,000,000 acres of unused land in New England; 35,000,000 in the Middle States," and so on. Where did you get those figures?

Mrs. LUND. Those figures were taken from a bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. And you furnished them to the Senator?

Mrs. LUND. I did; and it might interest you to know that just about three months ago I went up to Boston to arrange about land in Massachusetts, and it would interest you to know what private capital was willing to do about that.

The CHAIRMAN. There are available lands in Massachusetts?

Mrs. LUND. Plenty of available lands in Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard Mr. Wood's testimony here yesterday, did you not?

Mrs. LUND. I think he was mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. He was against the colonization plan and said that there were no lands available in his section of the country. Do you agree with him on that?

Mrs. LUND. There is not as much land available in those thickly settled districts, but there are certain tracts. For instance, there is plenty of land in New Jersey, New England, and my information about Indiana is restricted to a statement made by one of the men from the Reclamation Service, that they knew there were certain tracts of land available to establish at least one or two of these colonies. I do not know Indiana, or Ohio, but I do know Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and I know all the Western country and the Northwestern and the South, and New England. I have personal knowledge of all those sections.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not agree with Mr. Wood as to these colonies all being a failure?

Mrs. LUND. There is a word to be said about those colonies. I have prepared a very brief outline of the colonization work in the United States. It really might be worth your while to take an hour some morning and let me go over them with you. As to the matter of community organization, if you go out in any county where there are farmers you will find men from the extension department trying to organize all those farmers and make them into a cooperative organization or a community organization in order to have better schools, better roads, better transportation and better credit, etc. Now, that is a community, it makes no difference how large the farming unit is. As soon as it becomes an organized community and has its little meetings it then becomes a community.

The CHAIRMAN. They are doing that all over the West, in California, Oregon, and Washington?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; the extension service through our State agricultural colleges is trying to put that idea across in every State, and, Mr. Chairman, may I say that the plan upon which they are based was worked out by Dr. Carver, who is at the head of the rural organization work in the Forward to Land League.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not called colonies or colonization schemes, but in fact that is just what they are doing.

Mrs. LUND. That is just what they are trying to do and there will never be success in farming until we do organize, because the small farmer has not capital enough to compete with the bonanza farmer unless he cooperates with his neighbors and they buy together and sell together. It is a matter of treating their combined acreage as a business unit the cooperation of the group. Individual energy and individual initiative, and voluntary cooperation and, gentlemen, whenever we do anything to impair that in this country, we have undermined that thing which makes us Americans and we are likely to become a suburb of Berlin.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, what were the total contributions contributed by the various parties for your purposes and other purposes in Washington?

Mrs. LUND. There is no money contributed except just to cover my bare living expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody else got anything from that?

Mrs. LUND. No; it was just to cover my expenses so I could keep this work organized. The Senators realized how I had been interfered with. In the beginning my magazine was to pay for the organization work, I planned to do this work without any expense to anybody, but when my magazine was wrecked that left me without funds for organization: Many times I have had money arranged for and had it upset.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether a man by the name of Mr. Bolton got any of those funds?

Mrs. LUND. Mr. Bolton?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a Mr. Bolton living in the city of Washington?

Mrs. LUND. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not he got out some press notices—

Mrs. LUND (interposing). Yes; he wrote the newspaper stories for me.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). That seemed to have come from the Grange and which we all thought came from the grange.

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he paid?

Mrs. LUND. I paid Mr. Bolton.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay him for getting out those press notices?

Mrs. LUND. I paid him, and it came out of my living this month.

The CHAIRMAN. You may not understand me. Did you pay Mr. Bolton for getting out those press notices?

Mrs. LUND. I paid Mr. Bolton for writing the stories.

The CHAIRMAN. For writing those stories?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There were three different press notices sent out.

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Consisting of about nine pages.

Mrs. LUND. I do not remember the number of pages.

The CHAIRMAN. How much was Mr. Bolton paid?

Mrs. LUND. I paid Mr. Bolton \$50 for that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

Mrs. LUND. I think it is R. L. Bolton. It is R. something. He is a stranger to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is R. L. Bolton?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his address?

Mrs. LUND. The Press Club is all the address I have.

The CHAIRMAN. If he is a stranger to you, how did you happen to secure his services?

Mrs. LUND. Because Mr. Dupré here in the city has very often written stories for me, and I sent to Dupré to write this grange story and asked him if he would take the testimony Mr. Atkeson would give before you, when I knew Mr. Atkeson was coming before the committee—I had known what the resolution passed by the National Grange at the Syracuse meeting was, and I naturally knew that Mr. Atkeson would take the grange point of view with regard to it. I wanted that publicity gotten out so that the people in Congress would know that the grange was against this thing. The grange told me that they could not get their stuff printed in city papers; that is, they have a publicity bureau up at the grange furnishing press matter to agricultural papers, and they have told me in times past—it was not told me with regard to this particular thing—but they have told me before that they have trouble getting their stuff published by city papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this some of the money which Senator Weeks and Senator Harding contributed that was paid him?

Mrs. LUND. It was out of my little living fund. They did not know how I was going to use it. May I make the statement that neither of the Senators knew that I was using it for other than my expenses? They knew I did not have more than enough, and I had to borrow money this month to make that up.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not report it to them?

Mrs. LUND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not give them any itemized statement?

Mrs. LUND. No; because they only give me enough to cover my living expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you state Mr. Bolton's address?

Mrs. LUND. The Press Club, I think I gave you.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his business?

Mrs. LUND. I do not know a thing about him, excepting Dupré said, "Mrs. Lund, I am so busy I can not write this story for you," I said, "Can you send me some one?" and he said, "I will try; there is a fellow up at the club named Bolton, and I will send him over if I can get him." So pretty soon Bolton telephoned me and came over to see me and wrote those stories, and, gentlemen, I had had such experiences with the labor committee and the committee on the Curtis bill in keeping me from making any statement that I expected the same treatment whenever the administration is interested. I have no grudge against any committee, but I expected the State Socialists in the administration to shut out from hearings those opposed to them. The stories that Mr. Bolton wrote, as I said, he made up from the record which he saw of the testimony given by Mr. Atkeson.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he write them solely from that written testimony?

Mrs. LUND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And not from any suggestions coming from you?

Mrs. LUND. No; he wrote those stories without any statements from me.

The CHAIRMAN. Who distributed them around the House Office Building?

Mrs. LUND. I did or had it done.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, is that the syndicated newspaper article which represented that Mr. Atkeson had not received any attention from the committee and that he was shut off before he had a hearing?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and they are the articles which Mr. Atkeson repudiated and resented. Did you tell Mr. Bolton, Mrs. Lund, that Mr. Atkeson had not received a full hearing here and was treated in a very bad way by the committee?

Mrs. LUND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did Mr. Bolton get that idea?

Mrs. LUND. I do not know, unless it was in interviewing Mr. Atkeson about it. I do not know how he got it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson came on here and repudiated that.

Mrs. LUND. I did not attend the hearings, but my own experience before in trying to get before committees with any adverse statement has been such that I expected that feeling here. I did not know, as I do now, that you are willing to listen to opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. You felt, then, that you were justified in telling Mr. Bolton that Mr. Atkeson had not had a fair hearing?

Mrs. LUND. No; I did not tell him that. Mr. Bolton may have gotten that impression at the hearing. I did not attend the hearing. He wrote those stories himself. I have never sent out any publicity with a truculent note or a critical note in it before.

I do not like it, but inasmuch as the Grange say that they can not get their stuff printed, I thought perhaps it might be well to

leave that truculency in this time. It might make it carry. That was all. I confess I did not think of there being anything in it that would cause any special resentment from the committee, and I am ready to offer apology to the committee that the article should have contained that special "slam," now you tell me it is not true, I should, perhaps, have questioned or inquired more closely, or should have cut it out, because it would have been better omitted probably. But you see, gentlemen, I thought that you probably had been prejudiced against hearing any opposition. I know the other committees had been on the Crosser bill or the Curtis bill. The door was shut on any opposition hearing. That is why.

Mr. FERRIS. Mrs. Lund, this committee has granted almost three times as much time to the opponents of the bill as they have to those who favor the bill.

Mr. LUND. I did not know, and that had not been my experience. I have had a lot to contend with with these same Socialists over here. Of course, I did not blame you. I was a stranger to you and I simply thought you had been prejudiced against hearing any opposition, and thought that this man, Mr. Mead, knew all about it. The fact of the matter is the three people who have been longest in this work and know most about it and have made the most sacrifices for it and the longest study of it, two of them, or all three of us, really, come from California—George H. Maxwell and William E. Smythe, who have worked in California for years, made the first demonstration of community organization. They have not had sufficient money, but if they had State money to draw from we would not be hearing so much about the Mead plan—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have referred to the Curtis bill, and I want to read this paragraph from the preamble of that bill:

Whereas it is a solemn obligation of the Republic in this crisis "to care for him who hath borne the battle and for his widow and orphans,"

You think that is an obligation resting upon the Government?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; I do think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You want the soldier completely guaranteed through the ownership of a farm home?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Yet you do not think that the Government should supply that home?

Mrs. LUND. As you will see in that bill, I propose to use the unexpended immigration fund, amounting to \$9,000,000, to make a survey of the situation. You can not hope to get that information across this table in a few weeks, no matter how hard you try.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 2 of the bill, referring to the appointment of the board, it is provided—

Whose duty it shall be to develop a practical standard for rural colonies, and to establish such for the dependent families of the soldiers of the United States.

Do you mean for the Government to do that?

Mrs. LUND. You see, I knew that they had the Crosser bill, and I knew that they would take the soldier settlement bill and make use of that patriotic lever to get this sort of measure started. I said, "You must have something for the Government to do, and how little can we make that?" Here is what we proposed: "To develop a

practical standard for rural colonies and to establish such for the dependent families of the soldiers of the United States." The Government would work out the proper standard, and then our business men of the country would carry it out. Do you see how well it would work?

The CHAIRMAN. I think there is a little inconsistency between your position before the committee and this wording of the Curtis bill.

Mrs. LUND. You can not possibly put all that you think into a bill, and I am trying to tell you what I want in the bill. I say that because that bill was simply an entering wedge to be followed by the real broad after-legislation. In order to provide for a thorough study by a commission, we would need all of those things.

Mr. SINNOTT. You wanted to use the \$9,000,000?

Mrs. LUND. You can call it that, but suppose we had that \$9,000,000? We wanted to use it through a commission in developing a practical standard for rural colonies and establishing the dependent families of soldiers upon them. We would show them the way to do it, and we do think that that is an obligation of the country. That is plainly stated, with none of the camouflage methods that appear in this Lane-Mondell bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you another question: In this article by Senator Harding entitled "Rooting Valor in American Soil" the Senator makes this statement:

It is such homes that the United States should have had ready for occupancy by its soldiers and sailors at the time of their return.

Now, the implication in this article seems to be that the United States should get these homes ready.

Mrs. LUND. You see, what I thought was this, and the Senator you mention agreed with me, that you should have a commission appointed to deal with this situation, and that the commission should first be instructed to get out propaganda and to send lecturers and organizers into the business districts and tell them how to mobilize capital and credit so as to get ready for the soldiers. We think that that is the logical function of the Government—that is, to assist business in the way that it does assist through the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me get this clear: Do you mean to say that when this article was written containing this statement, "It is such homes that the United States should have had ready for occupancy by its sailors and soldiers at the time of their return," that the United States should have had ready for occupancy these homes or that some private individuals should have had them ready for occupancy?

Mrs. LUND. As I have said to you, the United States should take that initiative through that commission. They should get this work started for them, and if we had had the \$9,000,000 provided for in the Curtis bill, we would have been ready, because we would have used that \$9,000,000 in getting the capital and credit of the United States mobilized for this work. There is quite a difference between \$9,000,000 and \$500,000,000, provided in the Mondell bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is the positive statement that the United States should have had such homes ready for occupancy by sailors and soldiers at the time of their return.

Mrs. LUND. That may have been the statement that Senator Harding made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that your statement or Senator Harding's statement?

Mrs. LUND. It is Senator Harding's statement.

Mr. ELSTON. Did you prepare the manuscript of that statement and arrange for its publication? Did you prepare the statement and have Senator Harding revise it?

Mrs. LUND. All of those things I get out are reports of the people who sign them. They are partly written by them.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the composition of Senator Harding's article yours or his?

Mrs. LUND. It is his, although a part of it is made up from my papers.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the actual phraseology taken from your paper?

Mrs. LUND. A good deal of it, or some of it, is from the paper.

Mr. ELSTON. Did you arrange for its publication?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. You made all the arrangements for having it published?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Referring to that particular expression read by the chairman, that the United States should have had such homes ready for occupancy by the soldiers and sailors at the time of their return—

Mrs. LUND (interposing). My understanding is that that should have been qualified, as I have stated here. Senator Harding talked to me about the proposed legislation, and in conferences we had discussed this and considered how it should be done. I think I can say that Senator Harding would have qualified that. That statement was an article, and not a legal brief. It simply said that we were not ready, and that the Government was not ready. We had no commissions appointed on reconstruction, as other countries had.

The CHAIRMAN. Following that statement, after deploring the failure of the Government to do anything, this statement occurs:

Now, the duty of the Government is to pull this situation together as best it can and save what it can out of the wreck of neglected opportunity. An ideal situation existed with relation to returning sailors and soldiers.

Mrs. LUND. That is what we proposed to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You really wanted the Government to do something?

Mrs. LUND. We really did. We will have a method worked out this week, but I hope a provision that will meet our ideas may come out of this committee, we all want the committee to have the credit for anything that may be done to put soldiers on farms.

Mr. ELSTON. Who will introduce that bill?

Mrs. LUND. I would prefer for the committee to bring out the details of the bill. We will make the suggestions and let you do what you please with it. You should have the first chance at it. I fixed up a compromise bill, if we must have the Government do it? I do not think we need to have the Government do this. I think this bill better than the Mondell bill. May I read this bill or leave it with you for any amendment you may want to work out in connection with it?

The CHAIRMAN. You may incorporate the bill in the record.

That to provide rural homes for those who served with the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and her allies, and Germany and her allies, and who have been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army Reserve, and former American citizens who served with and were honorably separated or discharged from the military or naval forces of any of the nations allied against the Central Powers, and who have been repatriated, or the widows or orphans of such persons, all of whom are hereinafter referred to as soldiers, there is hereby established a fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the soldiers' relief fund, to be administered by a commission of five members not now holding office, to be appointed by Congress in such manner as Congress may determine, and said commission is hereby authorized to use said fund to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. That said commission may acquire by gift, purchase, deed in trust, or otherwise, the necessary lands for soldier settlement projects and may withdraw, utilize, and dispose of by contract and deed, public lands suitable for such purpose; provided, however, that no lands shall be acquired unless the price to be paid and the conditions under which they are acquired shall first be approved, (a) by a representative of the governor of the State in which the lands are located, and (b) by an appraiser designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and (c) by the commission.

SEC. 3. The commission is authorized to engage in such undertaking and do such work as it deems necessary for the proper and permanent development and equipment of the farms in such projects, and in such undertakings and work in reference thereto, preference shall be given to the employment of soldiers.

The commission shall establish a standard for such rural or farm settlements under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe. And in the establishment and operation of such standard settlements the commission may consult and cooperate with such agencies as it deems advisable. And the Commission is authorized to set aside for schools, churches, community centers, and for other public purposes such lands as it deems necessary.

Soldier applicants for such farms must agree to live upon the same and must enter into such contracts and agreements with the commission in reference to the payment for such farms and for the operation of the same and in reference to all other matters in relation to such farms as the commission shall prescribe.

And the commission is authorized to assist, upon such terms and conditions as it may deem advisable, any soldier who has had experience in farming and who is competent to conduct a farm, to acquire a farm in any part of the United States.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, the sum of \$200,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and of this sum the commission is authorized to expend any amount not to exceed \$250,000 in such manner as it may deem advisable in securing the cooperation and assistance of State commercial organizations and their interested bodies throughout the United States.

There are several reasons why a commission could better deal with the land settlement subject than a department of the Government.

First, there is inevitably jealousy between the Department of Agriculture, Labor, and the Interior. All would like this big work done with their own machinery. A commission could, therefore, draw greater cooperation from all of them than either from the others.

Furthermore, a commission would probably select experts on the several subjects connected with land settlement, and these men would serve continuously irrespective of political changes. I feel that Secretary Lane's preference for having the Government to do all of this work has helped to keep much good from being done during the past seven years of his incumbency.

When I first brought my plans to the attention of Secretary Lane, and your chairman has just indicated that the plans are identical, save that I want private enterprise to develop them, and Secretary

Lane wants Government action, Mr. Newell, then Director of Reclamation, became a member of my advisory board, and both he and Mr. Blanchard were very anxious for me to develop some part of my plans in the Department of the Interior rather than in the Labor Department.

Both of these men urged Secretary Lane to see me and cooperate. They promised their cooperation. But when Mr. Newell resigned and Mr. Davis took his place, Mr. Blanchard was obliged to withdraw all promise of cooperation. I have never met Mr. Davis.

Mr. WHITE. Do you understand that there is any suspicion of socialism proposed in the project here, as set forth in the Mondell bill?

Mrs. LUND. The Crosser bill was a Socialist bill. Both are State socialism—that is, the Government is to go into the colonization business and act as employer. State socialism or Government ownership is a far greater menace than direct socialism, because State socialism is but an extension of capitalism, and the Socialists admit that. Here is an editorial that I clipped from the New York Call the other day, and it will take only two minutes to read it:

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

We are inclined to agree with the National City Bank circular for June when it asserts that workingmen are in error in assuming that Government ownership of industry necessarily implies any gains for them. Aside from the theoretical aspect of the question, there are the facts that are apparent to all. The quasi public ownership of telegraphs under the administration of Postmaster Burleson, his conduct of the post office itself, indicates that the Government owned or managed enterprise can become more exploitive than even the privately owned enterprise.

Ownership of any kind can not eliminate the evils of capitalism until the workers themselves have mastery of their industrial life. This mastery carries with it a form of ownership that is not only social, but a form of management and operation controlled by all those who contribute useful labor. This is the essence of industrial democracy, of labor democracy. State-owned industry is generally managed from the same point of view that privately owned industry is. That is, for cheap production and cheap service, which in turn are secured by cheap labor. Another reason, especially in the case of State-owned railways and transport facilities, is to afford an efficient ally for military purposes. It is significant that every nation with such railways that entered the war took over its transportation systems.

Still another reason why the management and policies of State-owned and privately owned services are the same is that politicians of capitalist parties are selected as administrative heads of State-owned services. They can no more avoid applying the practices and methods of the capitalist order they represent than the capitalist owners themselves. So wedded are they to these practices that such administrators often permit capitalist owners and contractors to attach themselves in some way to public services as leeches who bleed these services for all they are worth.

The National City Bank sees what the Socialist sees, though it is not quite so frank as to details. We see what it sees, and more, and have nothing to lose by pointing it out.

That editorial contains the Socialist point of view as against State socialism. They regard it as an extension of capitalism and the building up of a bureaucracy. Some Socialist radicals want the Government to do things; they advise the Government to take them over, thinking that they will get them away from the Government and run them themselves. However, most of them think that it will result in the intrenchment of capital at Washington and the centralization of vast powers in the bureaus, so that it will be really

capitalistic control. That is the fear that is expressed by the Socialist organs as well as by the most conservative business men.

The CHAIRMAN. There was an article that appeared in a magazine within the last few months by Senator Curtis. Do you know about that article?

Mrs LUND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you assist in the publication of it?

Mrs. LUND. Yes, sir; it appeared in *Munsey's* for October.

The CHAIRMAN. Has Senator Harding introduced a bill on this subject?

Mrs. LUND. He has not. Senator Harding says that whatever is done should be done by Mr. Mondell and Senator Smoot, and that whatever is done on the soldier settlement proposition should come out of the committees. We want to help you out, because we have given a lot of time and study to it. There will be no bill introduced by anybody else if we can get you to cover these points in your legislation. If you are not influenced by our judgment, we will have a bill introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had a little over one hour and a half. Do you feel that you have had a full and fair hearing?

Mrs. LUND. I am very much pleased with what you have accorded in time and courtesy. May I make clear in your record before I go that this bill that I have given to you is my idea of a compromise. It is not my idea of what would be the best thing. My idea of what would be the best thing would be to have a commission appointed to concern itself with research and information, which should be distributed through newspaper, magazine, moving picture, and lecture platform publicity. The commission should study the matter of farm settlements, industrial housing, and cooperation, because without cooperation to show how credit may be mobilized for this work we can not do any of these things.

I will be very glad to give you a list of the people who I wanted to have heard. Mr. Harold Foight, director of the rural schools of the Bureau of Education, was to give an illustrated lecture and show what they have done in Denmark and the United States in the schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Lund, I find that we must conclude these hearings. We have devoted fully two weeks to the hearings, and I do not think there is any diversity of sentiment in the committee as to the feasibility of the community plan. Of course, others think that it should be enlarged to include the segregated units. However, I do not think it is necessary to go into that general proposition.

Are you aware that Mr. Atkeson came before the committee and repudiated the suggestion that he had been treated unfairly?

Mrs. LUND. If you read the newspaper article written by a man named Hallam, who puts things on the press table, in regard to this matter—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Just a moment, please. Do you know that Mr. Atkeson came before the committee and repudiated the insinuation or implication of unfair treatment or antagonism toward him?

Mrs. LUND. Then, if he did he must know what he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he resented it.

Mrs. LUND. Well, I do not know——

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not feel that you are under an obligation to set the committee right, you having set in action the other publicity?

Mrs. LUND. Is there anything I need to do, if Mr. Atkeson has made that—corrected the statement?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in his testimony. We will leave it to your own sense of right and justice, because this committee has been held up before this Congress and the country as refusing to give Mr. Atkeson sufficient time to testify, and as having been in antagonism to him and to the Grange personally.

Mrs. LUND. I did not get that impression from the newspaper article, and I think you read more into it than is there.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Atkeson read that into it himself, and he stated that he would not be red-blooded if he did not resent it.

Mrs. LUND. What can I do about it? If there is anything I can do to right it, I will right it.

The CHAIRMAN. You can read Mr. Atkeson's testimony.

Mrs. LUND. I will read his testimony and will write a statement that will set it right. If it does not, I will let you rewrite it.

The CHAIRMAN. "And they lived happy ever afterwards."

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock, noon, the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, June 19, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the committee will come to order.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am authorized to state to the committee that I have had word from Secretary Lane that he is unable to attend this morning, and I think, in frankness, it ought to be stated that Secretary Lane believes that unless some member of the committee wants to ask him some questions he really has stated all he desires to submit in his letter and in his previous statement here. He asked me, however, to convey the information to the committee that when he spoke here before, some two or three weeks ago, he had received in response to his inquiry cards 52,000 cards and 11,000 letters from soldiers expressing an interest in this matter and expressing a desire to avail themselves of it. Since that time, and while these hearings have been in progress, he has received additional replies, making a total of 65,000 cards and 15,000 letters, which makes 80,000 communications altogether from soldiers on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. How many, all told?

Mr. FERRIS. Eighty thousand. He also asked me to state to the committee and for the record that he is receiving now 1,200 a day, and about 800, or two-thirds, of them are coming from overseas and 400 from the soldiers on this side. The Secretary is perfectly willing to come back if the committee wants him to, but he feels that in

his letter and in his statement which he made before he has said everything he could say on the subject and has not anything to add. I am reminded to state that the first returns that came from overseas were on May 30. Prior to that time they had not had a chance to be consulted on the subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mondell is here this morning. I asked him to come over, thinking he might wish to make an additional statement. The committee will be glad to hear you, Mr. Mondell.

**STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. MONDELL, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING.**

MR. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity for saying a few words more in regard to this bill. I realize you are wearied with your long hearings and anxious to conclude your hearings on this subject and get to other matters, and I would not take the time of the committee if it were not for the fact that some things said during the hearings present a situation, perhaps, requiring some statement from one of those who had to do with the drafting of the legislation; and in view of the fact that the Secretary is not able to discuss the matter further with you, I felt as though it was my duty to do so. Whenever the committee gets tired or thinks I have talked long enough, just let me know and I will close my statement.

THE CHAIRMAN. Would you prefer to conclude, Mr. Mondell, before answering questions?

MR. MONDELL. Yes; I would like to make a statement without interruption, if I may, although if any member of the committee desires to ask questions that relate directly to the matter I am discussing at the time I shall be glad to answer them. Other questions I would prefer, if it is agreeable to the gentlemen, that they withhold until I conclude.

The discussion on this bill has taken so wide a range that it is perhaps important that some one again review the genesis of this movement and call attention to the conditions believed to exist which seemed to render wise legislation which would help the returning soldiers—and that means all of the men who were in the service—to secure a home on the lands.

Before the war closed, farsighted men—and the Secretary of the Interior is one of those, gentlemen—of both parties on this committee who have had experience in matters of this sort turned over in their minds the situation that the coming of peace would present. Their thought was that there was likely to be a condition under which the Government ought to make some special effort to take up the slack in the labor market, to insure a condition under which the returning soldier would not find himself without means of employment or displace others who had secured employment.

In other words, one of the important situations that we had to look forward to was that of the possibility of a condition under which it would be necessary to do all that we could properly do to find employment for our people. My opinion is that perhaps we were overanxious or unduly disturbed in that regard. It looks now as though there might not be the necessity, or as great a neces-

sity, as we anticipated to provide for employment for the returning soldier. Fortunately, the business of the country seems to be getting to normal more rapidly than we had anticipated. That seems to be true. We do not know, however. Just now there seems to be jobs for almost every one who desires employment, but we have still many men in the military service, at least 1,000,000 men, who will be added to the country's active forces within the next six months, and we can not be sure that the business of the country is going to continue to return rather rapidly to the normal; and while I think it is true that there may not be the necessity for legislation furnishing additional avenues of employment to the extent that we imagined there might be, still we can not ignore the fact that there are still many soldiers to return to the ranks of active civil life and that there is still a situation that lays some obligation on the Federal Government in this regard.

We have tried to anticipate that situation through large appropriations for the building of roads. All of the legislation of Congress that is wise tends to create or maintain a condition in the country under which men may find employment and opportunities, so that, in a general way, we have been doing much, and hope to do more, in the way of not only providing opportunities for employment directly, but in maintaining and helping to create conditions under which opportunities for employment will be widened and improved.

Now, going beyond that, in those early days before the close of the war and in the days following the signing of the armistice, thoughtful men in the departments, in Congress, on this committee, and throughout the country had this in mind: Is it the duty of the Congress under conditions now existing to legislate further than it has directly, definitely with a view to affording opportunities to the returning soldiers? This is a great country of ours, and in normal times and under normal conditions the citizen asks nothing of his Government other than to be protected in his rights, to be afforded the opportunities which a well-governed land of great resources affords him. But the situation is quite different when some 4,000,000 men, having been temporarily taken from civil life, separated for the time being from the localities and conditions under which they have been living, returning to civil life, may, some of them at least, have views and expectations beyond and differing from those they had before they went into the service.

All of those who have thought of this matter to any considerable extent, or who have given it careful thought, have realized that the great majority of returning soldiers will not need or desire special opportunities of the Government—Federal, State, or municipal. The great majority of them will return home, and their lives in the future will be very largely along the lines they had determined upon before they entered the service. There will be a fraction who, having gotten out into the great world and seeing how men live in busy communities, and noting the attractiveness of cities, may be inclined to enter industrial or commercial life rather than to return to the farm homes and the country towns whence they came.

Now, those men, if conditions resume the normal within a reasonable length of time, will not ask or expect anything from the

Federal Government or from any government—that is, if industrial conditions continue good, and they are excellent just now in most parts of the country with very good wages, even as compared with the high cost of living. If they continue so, the man in industry, if he is self-respecting, and these boys are, is not asking anything of the Government except that we shall legislate wisely along general lines, all of which is helpful to the country at large and incidentally to him. He will receive good wages and he will live in a community where private enterprise is competing intensely with a view to serving him in every way. There is not an industrial community in this country that is not full of cooperative building and loan associations, and there is not one that has not a large number of very active and very forceful and very capable men whose business it is to build and sell homes, and those men can build and furnish homes, particularly with the aid of cooperative building associations, cheaper than any governmental agency on earth can do it.

There is another class of men who may not seek to go into industry, who have not been lured by the bright lights, who may actually turn from the cities, having lived in the open for a considerable length of time, to opportunities in the open, and they will go to various parts of the country. There are some public lands open; some very good opportunities for men who have sufficient acquaintance with the conditions to enable them intelligently to utilize them; there are some sections where lands are still very cheap compared with the value of their product. The country is not without opportunities of that sort for men who seek land. There are many of them, here and there, and elsewhere, and these men, many of them, will find those opportunities and they will not ask anybody to assist them in finding them.

But outside of these classes I have been mentioning, there will be men who desire the opportunity to secure a home, who prefer to have a home on a farm, and who may not be able to find the kind of an opportunity that is satisfactory to them, and it is that class of men, needing employment, looking forward to a home, that those who had to do with the drafting of this bill had in mind.

I think I have covered, very briefly possibly but as completely or as thoroughly as I am justified in taking your time in doing, the proposition that we are not called upon, and we are not expected to furnish any special opportunities to the great majority of the soldiers. We have no call or demand or request from them that we do so. The argument is made as against this particular plan of legislation that—assuming for the sake of argument—that we need not or should not go into the business of industrial housing, that confining our efforts wholly to the matter of attaching men to the soil, this is not the way to do it or the best or the fairest way to do it. Well, there are other ways of assisting men to secure farm homes, and one of them is by loans through the farm-loan banks. It may be that the farm-loan act ought to be amended. There may be some argument in favor of amending it in a way to give special privileges to soldiers or special opportunities to soldiers. I do not care to argue that question particularly, but the experience of practically everyone who has had experience in movements at home or abroad looking to aiding men in securing homes on farms is that so far as the isolated tract or the segregated unit is concerned the matter must be ap-

proached and provided for from a purely business standpoint. The boy who does not care to leave his own neighborhood and go into the next congressional district—I understand some are complaining because a man might have to go into the next congressional district.

Of course it did not occur to me that we had become so provincial that we could not move across a county boundary without feeling that we were completely isolating ourselves from our fellows or that this plan would be opposed because it would not give the boys of every congressional district an opportunity to settle down next to the home folks or next door to their mothers-in-law. We passed the farm-loan act on the theory that it is not safe to lend money to men who are handling their own affairs here, there, hither, and yonder on the basis of more than 50 per cent of the value of the property. Now, it may be that some other committee having to do with that matter may conclude to make an exception with regard to soldiers and lend them 60 or 75 per cent. Some gentlemen have gone so far as to suggest a change in the farm-loan law to the extent of granting loans amounting to 100 per cent of the value of the property purchased. I have noticed that the gentlemen who have done that are mostly people who seem very anxious to hold the boys at home or in the congressional district, but there is no State in the Union, so far as I know, that is proposing to put a single solitary dollar of its good money in any such proposition as that. I have not heard of any local community that wanted to get behind it. There may be people who assume that Uncle Sam's money grows on bushes and who are so lacking in a sense of responsibility that they are willing to throw Uncle Sam's money in directions and for purposes in which they would not suggest that their States or communities should invest their money.

I do not think we can afford to urge that the Federal Government do anything in this regard that we would not be willing to advise our municipalities to do, or that we would not be willing to advise our States to do. My hope is that, if this plan is successful, the projects we undertake under this bill may be only the initial undertakings along these lines, the beginning of like undertakings by private enterprise, by municipalities in a small way, and by States in a larger way. Australia is the most recent example of a country that tried buying farms for men and putting them on those farms, and then leaving them to pay out. That plan was a failure. A reasonably careful man, and one who is anxious and expects to meet his obligations, ordinarily does not care to assume that sort of burden. I think I am a fairly good farmer, but I doubt if at any time in my life I would have been safe in acquiring a farm on a loan amounting to the entire cost of the farm. I do not believe I would have had incentive enough. I would not have had sufficient stake in the enterprise to support me in the struggle that would have been necessary to pay for the farm under those circumstances. I realize that it would be very helpful for men who have farms to sell in the country to have a lot of Federal money lying around loose for the purpose of buying those farms and paying for them at a high price. We can not look at the matter from that standpoint. We must look at it, first, from the viewpoint of the interest of the soldier, and, secondly, from the viewpoint of the interest of the taxpayer, one of whom the soldier is and will continue to be.

In my opinion, you do not do a man a kindness to make what practically amounts to a free gift of a farm, and I do not know of any soldier with the right kind of training and disposition that expects you to do it; although it may be that the farm-loan act ought to be amended and made more liberal.

It may be that the farm-loan act ought to be amended in a way to make its terms more liberal to soldiers as a class, but if you are to do that it is not the province of this committee, because you do not have jurisdiction over that law. I would suggest that any committee that does so should provide that any community that desires to have that done shall put up 25 per cent of the 100 per cent loan. I do not believe that you would find a community in the United States that would meet those terms. They would not be willing to put 25 per cent in the pot and then give Uncle Sam a lien on the property for the return of his money. There might be some people who would be willing to put up the 25 per cent and take the first lien, on the theory that they would at least get that much back and then let Uncle Sam carry the load. I can not think of anything that would have so unfortunate an effect upon the business morals of the country as to enter upon a plan of going abroad and buying cultivated farms for men and handing them over to them. It would not be a kindness to the soldier, and it would be a most indefensible act of special privilege to certain men. Certainly we could not do that in the case of all the soldiers, or in the case of any considerable number of them, out of the 4,000,000; but we would find enough, no doubt, who might be willing to accept that sort of grant to make it cost as much as the war has cost up to this time. It would not take a very great proportion of the 4,000,000 soldiers on a basis of that sort of undertaking to make the cost as great as the cost of the war has been, leaving the country in a completely demoralized condition.

Now, that being true, as I see it, with regard to aid and assistance in securing segregated, improved farms, the question arises, What can we do? Well, fortunately, the world affords us innumerable examples of what can be done, and done successfully, in the matter of giving men an opportunity to work themselves into homes on farms. When Denmark lost her southern provinces to Germany she found herself limited in productive area and threatened with bankruptcy as a nation. She had a lot of sandy and sour land that in the days of her larger area men did not use or utilize except in a limited way for pasturage purposes. She set about reclaiming those lands, and succeeded in making them among the best dairy lands in the world. Denmark became a greater State through her reclamation efforts after she had lost Schleswig-Holstein than she was before. That has been true also of Australia and of some parts of Germany. Our own experience in reference to reclamation projects has not been uniformly satisfactory, because we did make some mistakes in the beginning in the selection of projects when the work was new, and, naturally, some things were done that would not be done now in the light of greater experience. Yet there are two projects in my State, to use them as an illustration, which have brought people from almost every State in the Union, most of whom with very little to begin on, who are working out farm homes—and very satisfactory farm homes—on those projects.

The history of governmental effort toward bringing men back to the land the world over, I think, makes it very clear that when you pass beyond those operations that must be based on strict business principles and business experience, as related to helping men secure isolated farms or segregated tracts, the only successful method for assisting men who have very little to begin with to secure homes and pay for them is through the organization and development of communities. I have been very much interested in an article that is very excellent in many respects, published in the April number of the Sea Power magazine, entitled "Rooting Valor in American Soil."

Mr. FERRIS. That is the instructive article referred to here yesterday.

Mr. MONDELL. There are so many good points in this article that I do not know whether the committee has had its attention called to all of them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Whom is that article from?

Mr. MONDELL. It is said to be from Senator Warren G. Harding.

Mr. NICHOLS. We have heard otherwise.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, let me tell you what conclusion Senator Harding came to and what a wise conclusion he came to. After discussing this whole field he came to the conclusion that "the principle that underlies this whole land scheme is that of cooperation." He relates the experience of England in the matter and discusses the question of the cooperation of the many agencies necessary for success. Then he goes on to say:

In the first place, this plan contemplates the development of colonies, not of individual isolated homes. To plant colonies it is necessary to acquire tracts of land of considerable area. These are obtainable in all sections of the country within 50 miles of New York, Cleveland, St. Louis, New Orleans, or Washington. There are 30,000,000 acres of unused land in New England, 35,000,000 acres in the Middle States, 180,000,000 in the Pacific States, making 425,000,000 in all.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you mention Indiana?

Mr. MONDELL. I have a high regard for Indiana, because some of the men who have most informed and enlightened me in regard to these matters are sons of Indiana. The best-informed man in the world, in my opinion, upon these various subjects, including the subject of colonization and development and the aiding of men to become home owners on the land, is a famous son of Indiana, Dr. Elwood Mead.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit me to state there, Mr. Mondell, that we are indebted to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Benham, for the appearance before the committee of a lady who furnished the material for the article you have just told us about.

Mr. MONDELL. That is another contribution from Indiana.

Mr. BENHAM. I am also proud of that distinction.

Mr. MONDELL. There is a gentleman now with the Interior Department, a citizen of Indiana, who has given me a great deal of accurate information on this subject. Now, I have quoted enough from Senator Harding's article to make it clear that the Senator, having gone over the entire ground, and considered all these various plans, proposals, and suggestions, came to the conclusion that every man I have ever known has come to, when he has studied the matter carefully and unselfishly and without any thought of his congress-

ional district or county or township, but thinking only of the whole country, that if we are going to do something that is really helpful and that we can defend, that we will not have to apologize for, and that we will have no regret in regard to the future, we must adopt the plan of development by communities.

The Senator goes further in his article and shows how the land is to be acquired for those communities, and how it is to be divided up into small farms. He goes further than it would probably be wise to go in a majority of cases, because he would clear, fence, dig wells; would buy the horse, cow, pigs, and flock of chickens. Now, that is what this bill contemplates, except that it contemplates that when it comes to the house and barn and flock of chickens, to the pigs, and to the farm horse, the man shall make some direct contribution, so that he will really have a stake in the enterprise.

In this article the Senator laments the fact that the boys have largely returned, and that a great opportunity has been lost by delay. To a certain extent all of that is true, and that is why it is important to secure this legislation as soon as possible, because time is passing. The boys are returning and they are taking up work along various lines and they are seeking opportunities. There are, however, a great many still to return, and some of those who have returned are only temporarily employed; so that we are not altogether too late. The last Congress was a war Congress, and it was very difficult for that Congress with its mind bent upon the prosecution of the war to turn its attention to matters of conservation, matters of development, and matters of restoration. Now, what does the Senator finally say about this situation? He says:

Now, the duty of the Government is to pull this situation together as best it can and save what it can out of the wreck of neglected opportunity.

I agree with the Senator, and that is what we are proposing to do. What we are proposing to do is exactly along his lines. We are following his plan just as though we had drawn this bill after reading his article. I give the Senator full credit for it. I have always had a high regard for him, and I give him full credit for having analyzed the situation and reached the proper determination with regard to what ought to be done.

Of course, there is something in this article about doing all this by private enterprise. I understand that Mrs. Lund, who was before the committee yesterday and who made some reference to this article, suggested that this development ought to be done by private enterprise, and I say amen to that. If it can be done by private enterprise—and I am in hopes that we shall so blaze the way and indicate the processes and prove the feasibility of development along these lines that private enterprise will extend its operations—well and good. Private enterprise has been engaged since the beginning of time in work of this character, but generally on a comparatively small scale. It is not a new field, however, for public or private enterprise by any manner of means, and so far as I am personally concerned, I disclaim any special credit for the plan and purpose of this bill. A good Republican friend of mine said the other day, "While I advised you to draw some legislation along the lines of providing farm homes to soldiers, I did not expect you to adopt the Lane plan." I do not know that I did adopt the Lane plan, though

Secretary Lane has long advocated a development plan, as have others, including Senator Harding. I do not care what you call the plan, but it is in my opinion the only plan through which you can furnish farm homes to men who must begin with comparatively little except an enterprising mind and a good right arm. This is a plan by which you can accomplish your purpose without robbing the man of his self-respect and without creating a condition in the country for which you would have to apologize. I have not followed these hearings except in a very general way, and I do not know just what has been stated here, but I will venture to say that practically every one who has been before this committee proposing other plans has through cross-questioning by the committee been called upon to express doubt of the success of the other plans, and has been compelled to acknowledge that they involve expenditures of billions of dollars at the very least. Now, I may be mistaken about that, and, perhaps, that is not true, but this is an intelligent committee and it is familiar with the situation, and I know that is the inevitable result of the cross-examination of men who may come forward with other plans.

Some people hurl anathemas at this bill because they say it is a reclamation proposition, and a dear friend of mine became so disturbed about that that he wanted to change the language of the enacting clause so as not to offend anyone who did not like the word "reclamation." It is a reclamation project, and that is one of its very great virtues. It is not proposed to displace any man who is on a farm; it is not proposed to put some other man in place of a man who is now on a well-tilled, well-cared-for, and well-kept farm. What particular good would be accomplished through that sort of a process? What good could be accomplished by displacing some one who is now on a farm, having him move to town, and putting some one else on the farm to whom you have loaned its full value, and who therefore has no stake in it? If the crops are all good, well and good; and if he pays out, well and good; but if he does not he has not lost anything and has had a good living in the meantime. This bill proposes reclamation projects in every State in the Union, and that is one of its essential features. When you plan and propose to take men who have saved but little and give them an opportunity to acquire a home, there must be along with it an opportunity of employment in the acquirement of the home. You will give the man an opportunity to work a year or two years, or whatever the time may be, until the project is developed, during which period, with the hope and expectation of a home, he will have had the necessary incentive to save. He will save, because he will be looking forward to a home, and with that saving he will be able to meet the first small payment and the comparatively easy requirements with regard to improvements, live stock, etc.

Of course, it is true that one of these soldier boys might work elsewhere and then come to a project as it is nearing completion, and, of course, he would be given an opportunity to purchase, the preference, however, being given to the man who had worked on the project. I have no doubt but what there would be numerous opportunities for men who have worked and saved elsewhere on these projects, but primarily we want to help the man who needs the incentive and who will see the goal ahead of him.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are on that subject of reclamation, I have here a clipping from a newspaper which contains the form of a protest to be sent to Congress, showing, alleging, or claiming that it is just a plan to reclaim swamps, deserts, and cut-over lands. This is from some rural newspaper—the American Agriculturist.

Mr. MONDELL. This is entitled:

Vigorous protest to Congress against Lane bill to spend \$500,000,000 reclaiming distant swamps and deserts for soldiers who prefer farms in their own State—A better plan which will employ right here in the Middle States agricultural development every dollar that our taxpayers or investors may put up.

This is from the American Agriculturist of June 7, and seems to be a part of a general propaganda sent out by the agriculturists. I do not know whether you gentlemen ever heard the definition given some years ago by a certain statesman of an agriculturist as a man who farmed the farmer. I think it is a very good definition. We do not have to go far to find these gentlemen; you can find some of them in the Maryland Agriculture College. There are a lot of comfortably situated gentlemen there who, I presume, are paid out of the Federal Treasury—they are if they belong to the branch of that college which is supported by the Federal Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON. What college is that?

Mr. MONDELL. The Maryland College of Agriculture out here at College Park, about 5 miles from here. They have appealed to the Congress in the name of the farmers of Maryland. They are paid by the Federal Government, and they are protesting because some one is proposing, so they say, to bring other acres into cultivation to compete with the acres now under cultivation.

Now, I have heard that song ever since I can remember. A gentleman by the name of Buchanan sung it a great many years ago in connection with a veto of the homestead bill. Folks now and again, here and there, have echoed it every time Congress has proposed land opportunities anywhere. We heard it quite widely when we were arguing the reclamation law; but in all that time I never heard a real farmer utter any sentiment of that sort. It was always the agriculturist, the well-paid, well-fed agriculturist, who in one way or another was farming the farmer—to his benefit in some cases, no doubt, but at any rate the anxiety, the fear of additional acres brought into competition with his acres has never, so far as my experience goes, came from a man who tills the soil.

Why? Because, first, while he has no monopoly on horse sense, the man who lives close to the soil all his life, or a large part of his life, is generally distinguished above all else for his hard, common, horse sense, and he also has some knowledge of facts. He may not have a college education, but he has a fair notion of the size of his country and of the limitless area of its cultivated acres, and the tremendous volume of its agricultural products, and when you talk to him about bearing the market for agricultural products because you open 50,000 acres or 25,000 or 40,000 or 100,000 acres somewhere, he will laugh at you. It is the man who assumes to speak for him and who has some ax of his own to grind that talks that sort of thing.

Mr. FERRIS. Is not that contention almost as absurd as for a school teacher to advocate closing the schools so that he may have a monopoly?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it would be about in the same category. The fact is, that since time began and men began to farm, there has never been a time in any land under the sun where there were too many acres cultivated, and sooner or later, the activities of every government, that has ever existed, has been invoked for the purpose of encouraging movements back to the land or movements to the land, and the development of farm areas for many reasons: First, because there is where you get your best citizenship. That is the sort of life that makes men most nearly normal, sensible, and reasonable, and it is the one industry on the face of the earth that is absolutely essential and the only one. Therefore, naturally, wise legislators the world over, and since time began, have legislated with a view to encouraging men to own land and to till the soil.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Mondell, right there, is it or is it not true that the other nations are only making efforts along this line and not for any general bounty to their soldiers?

Mr. MONDELL. That is true. Some gentlemen, I think, have not clearly understood what the effect of the passage of this bill would be, and that is not to be wondered at in view of the fact that the bill itself carries nothing that indicates just the procedure with regard to appropriations under it. This bill carries no appropriation. If it becomes a law the Secretary would have nothing under it except authority, and he could not exercise that authority in any important respect without an appropriation. So that immediately following the passage of this legislation, or, possibly, in conference by general agreement, as the bill came to its final stages, a provision would have to be made for an appropriation of a comparatively few thousand dollars, sufficient to enable the Secretary to make his first estimate and present his first projects under this bill. Under this act, while Congress will not initiate projects, Congress will have a complete veto on projects, as it now has a veto on projects under the reclamation law, so that the legislating committee of the House and the membership of the House will have complete control.

Now, some folks have suggested that all this money might be used here, there, or yonder. I am not worried about that personally at all. I do not expect my section to be entirely overlooked, neither do I expect that it shall have more than a reasonable share, or that it ever will receive a dollar unless it has a thoroughly feasible project. I am not fearful that the secretary will spend all this money in the South, or in the Northwest, or in the East. I am confident that it will be distributed; but in any event the Secretary must come to the Congress, unless we amend this bill, with his first projects, and tell us where he expects to undertake them and how much he anticipates they will cost. So that the Congress will have complete control, first, in the matter of the initial appropriation which will be, of course, properly phrased to enable him to make his first investigations, such as he has not already made, and present his first estimates. Congress will be in session, in my opinion, the larger part of the summer, and those things can be very promptly passed upon. The Secretary would be prepared to make his first estimate and the appropriation could be promptly made for carrying out that estimate. That would delay the matter a little, but it need not delay it long.

Now, I have taken up the time of the committee probably longer than I should, and as we are nearing the hour of the convening of the House, I shall not take the time of the committee further, unless gentlemen desire to ask me some questions.

Mr. BENHAM. If the time permit, there are several questions that I would like to have discussed by you further.

Mr. NICHOLS. And I would like to ask some questions after Mr. Benham is through.

Mr. BENHAM. There have been several references made in this committee, both by witnesses and members of the committee, in regard to the corrupt propaganda that has been conducted in rural newspapers and elsewhere with regard to the opposition to this bill. Now, having my eyes and ears open, I have frequently wanted to ask, in the first place, whether there is any crime committed if people who are opposed to this bill talk and write against it; and, in the second place, I would like to have some one who knows to discuss fully, for my personal information, the question of how much this hearing in favor of the bill is costing the United States Treasury.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know whether that question should be directed to me, because I have not discussed propaganda here or elsewhere at any time, and I do not happen to be informed about the propaganda. Certain matters have come to my attention to which I have referred. The chairman of the committee can probably inform the gentleman as to how much it costs to consider questions before the committee, but I presume that the committee has never considered the length of its hearings from the standpoint of how much it might cost gentlemen to walk over here.

Mr. BENHAM. You are not directing your attention to the point that I have in mind.

Mr. MONDELL. I have said nothing about propaganda.

Mr. BENHAM. It may not cost anything to have those witnesses here who are testifying against the proposition, but my good friend, formerly of Indiana, but now of California, has crossed the continent one or more times, and I do not know whether that is purely philanthropy on the part of my good friend from Indiana or whether, being a part of the Reclamation Service, he is being paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has reference to Mr. Elwood Mead. I asked Mr. Mead to come here, and he came at my request. I have known him for years, and at my request he crossed the continent to discuss these matters with various people—

Mr. BENHAM (interposing). What I am trying to get at is at whose expense did he come?

Mr. MONDELL. Whether he came at his own expense or in connection with other work that he is engaged in I do not know. He is recognized as a splendid example of the man who knows about these things. However, I take it that if the committee should go into the matter of propaganda they would find that there has been very much more carried on in opposition to the bill than in favor of it. Of course, we must not forget this, that Congress, after due deliberation, appropriated \$100,000 for the purpose of examining projects with this very sort of plan in view; so that Congress itself

did start the work by making an appropriation for the purpose of examining projects.

Mr. GANDY. Was there not really an appropriation of \$200,000?

Mr. MONDELL. The \$100,000 that I referred to was directly and specifically made for this class of work. There was \$100,000 appropriated for examinations which would also tend to furnish information with regard to this class of work.

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask Mr. Mondell another question: When did you prepare this bill, or about what date?

Mr. MONDELL. I think I began work on it about the beginning of the recess, or soon after the 4th of March. I think I finally presented my draft of the bill to some gentlemen in the Interior Department about a week before Congress convened.

Mr. BENHAM. You suggested that some mistakes were made in connection with projects. Since you say you have read the hearings, I assume that you have read the testimony of the gentlemen representing the reclamation work, and I wanted to ask you whether mistakes, or governmental mistakes, have not been made in connection with matters of reclamation?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; there is no doubt about that, and I think I said that.

Mr. BENHAM. Do you understand that your statement, or that your admission is, or is not, in harmony with what has been stated in the hearings by gentlemen representing the Interior Department?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that anybody connected with the department has ever denied that mistakes have been made. For instance, they selected one project after a most careful examination and constructed a reservoir, but it developed after the water was turned in that the geological formation was such, or the rock formation was such, that the reservoir would not hold water.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Davis said that about 95 per cent of the money put into the projects by the Government would be returned, and that only about 5 per cent was in doubt.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not anticipate that any enterprise of this sort could go through to a conclusion without some mistakes being made. Anyone who has had any experience in business affairs knows that some mistakes are inevitable, and I should anticipate that eventually there might be some loss in an enterprise of this sort. The reclamation enterprise was undertaken at a time when we had very little information with regard to that sort of thing, and at a time when Congress did not have control, but, notwithstanding that, the mistakes have been comparatively few, and the project will, in the main, pay out.

Mr. BENHAM. You have given a few examples of enterprises of this sort, and have referred to Denmark. Do you want to go on record as speaking of the Denmark colonization scheme or the Denmark reclamation scheme as being a good example of colonization or a good example of reclamation?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, both. Of course, if you reclaim an area that has not been in a high state of cultivation, you necessarily colonize it.

Mr. BENHAM. I see that. Is that what this bill proposes to do?

Mr. MONDELL. Exactly; it is for reclamation and colonization. I think that is one of its great virtues.

Mr. BENHAM. Then, you are entirely in harmony with what has been done in years past in Denmark?

Mr. MONDELL. No two countries present exactly the same conditions.

Mr. BENHAM. There are some others who want to ask you questions, but I have in mind one more that I would like to ask: You spoke of this in several cases as a purely business proposition. Aside from the aid you furnish, and you concede that no necessity may exist in regard to employment, but taking it purely as a business proposition, would you improve the projects that we are talking about according to the method suggested in your bill as a purely business proposition?

Mr. MONDELL. First, I do not admit anything in regard to employment. I do not know what the conditions of employment may be, but I expressed the hope that they would not be as acute as we anticipated at one time. Therefore I was willing to assume, from that standpoint, that there might not be quite the urgency for something of that sort that we thought there might be at one time. I think that is entirely a matter of opinion. But speaking about the development of these projects, the only way in which areas that are not now utilized in an intensive way can be utilized advantageously is through development on a plan of reclamation and colonization. I think no one will doubt that. There might be a difference of opinion as to whether the Government ought to undertake it, as to whether the State ought to undertake it, or as to whether individuals ought to undertake it, but given an area that needs certain work in order to make it available for intensive cultivation, you can only accomplish that in a large way and, in connection with reclamation, through the colonization of the area.

Mr. BENHAM. You do not answer my question, or, at least, as I think it ought to be or with the fullness with which I think it ought to be answered. Now, here is a given amount of work to be done as a purely business proposition, taking the matter simply as a dollars-and-cents proposition. Would you say let the Government do it or let individuals do it?

Mr. MONDELL. So far as all of those things are concerned, if conditions were such that private enterprise could fully and adequately occupy the field I would say allow them, by all manner of means, to do so. It was because private enterprise did not fully, adequately, and satisfactorily cover the field that we provided the farm-loan act, and it was because private enterprise under certain conditions could not adequately occupy the field that we embarked upon the reclamation projects. It is because of the condition confronting us, in which we think there may be need of furnishing additional opportunities for employment and because we know there will not be sufficient opportunity to meet the demand of those who are seeking homes and who do not have money or credit with which to make the first payment, that we feel that the Federal Government should embark upon this enterprise. But I am sure that all of us hope that these projects will be so successful that private enterprise later on, as well as the States and municipalities, will take up the work, and that we shall prove in this work, as we have proved in the work of reclamation, that the Federal Government is simply blazing the

trail, pointing the way, illuminating the principle, and encouraging other agencies to take up the work.

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask one more question as a matter for my own personal information. I do not know the rules under which the committees work generally, and I wanted to ask this question to illuminate that point: Did you request to come before this committee because you had additional information to give the committee, or were you requested to come before the committee to combat the arguments that had been produced by gentlemen representing the other side?

Mr. TAYLOR. That, it seems to me, is not a proper question.

Mr. MONDELL. I am perfectly willing to answer that.

Mr. SMITH. It is an impertinent question.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it imputes a motive——

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). I desire to answer that question. I occupy a position of some responsibility in the House, thanks to my colleagues. I have had some experience in development work in one way or another, and particularly in connection with legislation having to do with development work. I have studied this question considerably, not only recently but in times past. I have been fortunate in having some very good friends who are interested in this class of work through public agencies and who have talked to me about their work at one time and another. I introduced this bill because the matter had been taken up in the last Congress, and gentlemen on both sides felt that it should be pursued by this Congress.

It is usual for a Member of the majority to introduce a bill which is regarded as being of such importance as this bill is, and it was suggested to me by various gentlemen that it might be well for me to interest myself in the matter. That I proceeded to do, not in my capacity as floor leader but as an individual Member of the House of Representatives. I want it thoroughly understood that I do not want to bind anybody or persuade anybody against his judgment in regard to the matter. So much for the drafting and introduction of the bill. I appeared before the committee and took up its time to a considerable extent, and I am under great obligations to the committee for its patience. I have kept somewhat in touch with your hearings, although I do not know all that has been going on here, and I expressed a desire to appear before the committee again before the matter was closed.

Mr. BENHAM. As a matter of personal information, I wanted to know if there was any natural stopping place for the hearings. I would infer from Mr. Mondell's statement to-day that other persons would have the right to be heard a second time, and I simply wanted to know as a matter of personal information as to what is customary in committee hearings. What I am trying to get at is this: Mr. Mondell's statement to-day might be regarded as a statement in rebuttal, and I wanted to find out whether it was customary to have arguments and then rebuttals.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a very natural process and the logical thing to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me suggest one or two things: Because of the fact that I have been interested in this matter and had charge of it in the last Congress, I have been consulting with Mr. Mondell several

times whenever he had the leisure, and I have personally urged him to assist us in every way he could. As a matter of fact, he was formerly the chairman of this committee, and was the chairman for a number of years when I was a member of it, and we of the West have the most implicit confidence in him. I might say, parenthetically, that we are all mighty glad that he is the leader of the House of Representatives at the present time. That is the way we feel in our country. I feel that it is not only proper, but that we should extend that courtesy to a former member of the committee, and especially a former chairman of the committee, to have him appear whenever he wants to come before us. Nobody has ever intimated that there was anything improper in that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I want to say that personally I have the highest regard for Mr. Mondell, and I think that it is perfectly natural that he should come before the committee and give us as many explanations as he can or as we may require to assist us in our deliberations. He is the author of the particular bill under consideration. Notwithstanding my regard for Mr. Mondell, I think he is fallible and that he is wrong in that measure. You say that this is a reclamation project?

Mr. MONDELL. I said it had been criticized on the ground that it was a reclamation project. It had never occurred to me that there was anything particularly bad or indefensible about projects of reclamation. The winning of America from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate has been one continuous project of reclamation. It has never been anything else. So I did not think the fact that it meant the development and declamation of acres that are not now utilized in an intensive way of itself discredited the proposition. As a matter of fact, I think that is one of its very great virtues, that it proposes to make many useful blades of many useful things grow where few grow now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Was this measure you have prepared and offered in this committee conceived as a reclamation project or conceived as an aid to the soldiers who had participated in the recent war?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I do not know that I quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, you said before in making your general statement that this is a reclamation project.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say that exactly, although I am willing to say it. I said that it had been assailed on the ground that it reclaimed land. If it did not reclaim land, if it did not add to the highly productive acreage of America, it would not be worth while in the interest of the soldier, because it would not help the soldier in the most practical way and would not help the soldier's country.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Mondell, will you answer this question: Was it conceived as a reclamation proposition for the purpose of reclaiming the land of the country and taking advantage of the unemployed soldier, or was it conceived as an aid to all the soldiers who might need it after they returned from the war.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, if I have time to begin back to where my first interest came in this matter—

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). No—

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). —well, I must, because the gentleman wants my view. I can not speak for other gentlemen.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Mondell, the reason I ask the question—

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). One minute, please.

Mr. NICHOLS (continuing). —is because the title of the bill says to provide employment and rural homes for soldiers.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; through reclamation.

Mr. NICHOLS. Only through reclamation?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; of one sort or another.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. One moment.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). —so far as the bill is concerned. In other words, under this bill you could not provide homes unless you had lands, and unless you put them in condition whereby the soldier could use them.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one moment. Mr. Mondell, a great many appearing before this committee have used the term "reclamation" in a somewhat odious sense, odious to them as meaning solely the irrigation of arid lands and the draining of swamp lands.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not assume that the gentleman had irrigation and reclamation confused.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why, because a person asks a question, you gentlemen who seem particularly interested in this matter from the far western standpoint should take offense. I had intended none. I am asking my questions sincerely, and I am not using the word "reclamation" in an odious sense. I believe in reclamation, and the questions I am asking are not for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. My remark was not toward you at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. I had no such intention.

The CHAIRMAN. I had no reference to you.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's question seems to imply, and is this simply a scheme of some gentlemen in the name of the soldier to do something that ought not to be done? That is practically what his question amounts to.

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not mean that. Mr. Mondell, I am not going to allow you to read into my questions a meaning of your own. I know what I intended by the question. If you do not understand it, I will try to make it plain, and if I can not, you not have to answer it. I want to know whether the purpose is to help a great majority of the soldiers or only a few of the soldiers. I will ask you a further question.

Mr. MONDELL. Will you let me answer the question? It will only help directly comparatively few of them. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Suppose that under this scheme of yours, Mr. Mondell, 3,000,000 soldiers desired to take advantage of the opportunity that was offered them under this bill, what would happen?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, in considering legislation I do not ordinarily consider a proposition which I know to be utterly impossible. I know, and we all know, that 3,000,000 soldiers are not going to seek this kind of an opportunity.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would it not cost just as much as you stated a moment ago in your original statement as much as the war has already cost, to take care of three-fourths of the soldiers under this proposition?

Mr. MONDELL. If three-fourths of the soldiers wanted to enter upon this sort of a proposition, it would cost a great deal of money, but no three-fourths of them or one-fourth of them will enter upon any enterprise that the Federal Government may launch in their behalf unless it be a pure gift, and no one, anywhere—I want to emphasize that—who has carefully considered the situation feels there is any obligation on the part of the Federal Government to do something especially out of the ordinary for the bulk of the soldiers, or that the bulk of the soldiers are expecting the Government to do anything extraordinary for them or anything out of the ordinary. In any situation that develops in a country like ours where a large number of men have to be considered, unless you are thinking about simply making a gift, which is unjustified and unjustifiable, whatever you do can only affect a limited number directly, but it affects the whole body of them by relieving the pressure all along the line.

Mr. NICHOLS. It helps everybody in that way—soldiers and everybody else.

Mr. MONDELL. It does, because if we only help 5 per cent of these soldiers to employment, or if you only help 5 per cent of them to secure homes, in helping them you would relieve the pressure all along the line, industrially and agriculturally, and you would relieve it to an extent that would be of very great value. Of course, my friend must remember this: It is very easy to criticize a particular proposition. It is often not so easy to suggest something in the place of it. Now, there are two things that this committee must determine; the first one is, should anything be done within the jurisdiction of this committee which will be useful and helpful to such soldiers as care to take advantage of the opportunities offered? That is the first question. If the committee determines that the situation does not demand any aid or any assistance or any effort on the part of the Federal Government within the lines of its jurisdiction, then it should not do anything and should drop the matter entirely. If, on the other hand, the committee determine that something should be done, it must consider this or some other definite and concrete thing within its jurisdiction.

Now, there may be people who think that, while we are not an industrial country, we ought to go into the matter of industrial housing. We have had a rather sorry experience of that very recently, but there are people who may think we ought to do that. That question does not come before this committee. It is not a matter for consideration by this committee. There are folks who may think that we ought to give a bonus to all the soldiers—a very few, I hope. That is not within the jurisdiction of this committee. There may be people who think we ought to make loans to soldiers as a preferred class, enabling them to go out here and there to buy farms. That is not a matter that comes before this committee. That belongs to the committee that has to do with the banking and currency and with the farm-loan act, and while it might be possible for this committee to

torture this bill—and I use that term advisedly, because it would be a torturing of it outside of its jurisdiction—to make a provision on it with regard to loans purely for the purchase of isolated or segregated tracts, the committee would hardly be justified in doing that, even though it might think there was some good reason for it being done by the committee which has jurisdiction over it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Mondell—

Mr. MONDELL (interposing). Mr. Nichols, let me go just a little further. If we are to afford these opportunities in settlements, which we think is the only way of affording the opportunities, it necessarily means that you are to take areas that are not now utilized to the extent that they could be or should be utilized. There are areas in the country that are exceedingly fertile, that are subject to occasional or annual overflows. We are helping in protecting those lands under the levee act and under the flood-control act. Under this bill a project of that kind could be undertaken that would make useful and highly productive an area which for the present is only utilized, if at all, in an indifferent way for pasturage during a part of the season. There are, I am told, various areas of considerable size in Massachusetts where lands have been abandoned where, with the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money in restoring those lands, they could be made attractive and useful and furnish farm homes on which men could make a very good living. I am told, and I am quite sure, there are cut-over areas and partly swamped as well as cut-over lands in Minnesota and in Michigan which by the removal of the stumps and roots, and with some drainage and possibly with some fertilization could be made very productive and the home of a prosperous community. There are, I think, areas of that sort in practically every State in the Union, with the possible exception of a State like Illinois, which is a wonderfully blessed Commonwealth with very little swamp and no cut-over land, and in the main subject to cultivation as it stands.

I do not know that Iowa would furnish an area of this kind. I am sure that Indiana could, and I am very confident that most of the other States of the Union would furnish such areas. They would furnish employment, in the first place, to those who seek that kind of employment, and by so doing they would relieve the pressure everywhere. It is not necessary to furnish employment under ordinary conditions, or even under extraordinary conditions, to all the population of the country in order to relieve conditions of unemployment, because even under the most trying conditions the percentage of men unemployed is always comparatively small, and it is the unemployed man and not the employed man you need to put to work. So you would employ men, and in employing them relieve the pressure all along the line on the man in industry against the pressure to lower his wages and also on the man on the farm. Then, in addition to that, you put the soldier to work where he has the incentive to save, free from the temptations of the city, where it is difficult to save, with all of the encouragement that men have when they see a coveted goal directly before them, and particularly the incentive that comes to men who work together in communities with a common purpose. We have seen that ever since men first landed here, and it has gone on clear through to the Pacific coast. Men have

developed and men have cut the forests and drained the swamps and leveled the rough land in communities.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Mondell, I would like to ask you a couple more questions. You say the Government is not called upon to help the great majority of the soldiers, or at least I so understood you.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think there is any condition in the country that demands that the Government as a government shall furnish employment or furnish opportunities for the great majority of American citizens. If there were such a condition, we would be in a bad way, and we could not legislate here in this committee to help it. The returning soldier is a part of our general citizenship. Four out of five of the soldiers return to the body of our citizenship with all the marvelous opportunities of America before them, expecting nothing except that they shall be protected in their rights, in their lives and liberty, and in the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. NICHOLS. But you believe the Government is called upon to help the soldier who wants to go on a farm?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the Government is called upon, first, to a certain extent at least, to make and afford opportunities of employment. I voted for an increase of the roadbuilding fund, as I have no doubt the gentleman from Michigan did, on that theory, and on that theory alone, nearly as much in one year, or much more in one year, than we are expecting to expend in a year under these projects. That appropriation was made on the theory that we needed to furnish employment.

Mr. NICHOLS. In this measure—

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Just let me finish answering your question, if you will. So I do think that while the condition is not likely to be as acute as to unemployment as at one time we anticipated, still there is a probability of a condition of unemployment that will require this additional assistance on the part of the Federal Government. That much for a beginning. Then, in addition to that, I think, in view of the fact we no longer have the boundless free lands and cheap lands of the West available for these returning men, we should furnish such of them as desire opportunities other than those afforded to them the opportunities that we present under this bill. I do not think, as I said earlier in my discussion, that the man who is going into the industrial centers at the very good wages now prevailing feels that the Federal Government owes anything to him. He is taking advantage of good wages amid conditions that are most satisfactory, in the main, for he has all of the opportunities afforded him by organized society, has all the pleasures that come to a man who lives in the midst of churches and schools and picture shows and all those things that go to make life agreeable in an industrial center.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is any unusual opportunity offered in this bill to the soldier who desires to go on the farm?

Mr. MONDELL. An opportunity is offered to him.

Mr. NICHOLS. Unusual?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that a soldier could go to work in a factory, and I have no doubt but that many of them will at the present high wages, having in mind the building of a home in the city or the purchase of a home in the country. Such a soldier will save a large part of his wages and will arrive at the home-owning condition we

are trying to establish through this bill. But there are other soldiers who will not do that, and we afford such soldiers an opportunity to work on a project and to become a part of it and secure the benefit of the preference that accrues by working on the project.

MR. NICHOLS. Mr. Mondell, you spoke antagonistically of the idea of a special privilege for all the soldiers. I want to ask you if you do not think it is the highest type of special privilege when you propose to assist in an unusual way, as you say, only those soldiers who propose to go upon the land.

MR. MONDELL. The opportunity is open to every man under the Flag.

MR. NICHOLS. But you know they can not all take advantage of it.

MR. MONDELL. Any man can take advantage of it who wants to.

MR. NICHOLS. No; if 3,000,000 of them took advantage of it you say the Government could not do it.

MR. MONDELL. Well, but those who want to can take advantage of it. The majority of the men, the men in your city, working at high salaries in factories, they are doing better than they would do on one of these projects, from their point of view. They do not want to live in the country. They want to live near the bright lights. They want the high wages and the abundant opportunities of the city; but if they wanted to go out and secure an opportunity to have a farm home the opportunity would be granted to them, and nobody is given anything under this act except an opportunity. Your argument, if I may suggest it, is the very same argument that was made against the homestead law. Mr. Buchanan said, "Why give men farms out West free? You do not do anything for the man who remains at home, in his own neighborhood, who takes no chance, who lives where he is comfortable, who does not want to subject himself to any unusual hardship or make any unusual effort. You do not do anything for him," said Mr. Buchanan, "and therefore you should not do anything for the man who is willing on account of his desire to secure a home to take advantage of an offered opportunity;" but we thought differently and we passed the homestead law. That has been the argument that has been made ever since against opportunities for men to secure homes on the farm; that you ought to give a man an opportunity to enjoy all the blessings and all of the opportunities of the surroundings that most please him, and then, at the same time, give him all of the advantages that may come to the man who is willing to make an unusual effort.

MR. NICHOLS. Of course, when you take us back to Mr. Buchanan, you are taking us back a long time, as you have done several times to-day, and you are taking us back to conditions that do not exist to-day. In referring to the city, Mr. Mondell, you spoke several times of the bright lights. Now, you do not believe that every soldier who returns from the war and decides that he will make his living in the city is lured only by the so-called bright lights that you refer to.

MR. MONDELL. There is a lure, and it is a lure that attracts all men, to remain in the comfort and security and certainty of settled and developed communities. There are the churches, the schools, the lyceums, the lecture courses, the opportunities for constant com-

munications with your fellow men, the pleasures of enjoying all of the institutions of a prosperous and highly developed community. It is a lure.

Mr. NICHOLS. And the industrial activity—

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). And the picture simply adds one more attraction, and we sometimes refer to it as illustrating the attraction, but the attractions are many.

Mr. NICHOLS. And they are also attracted by the industrial activity and because it is more to their liking.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, men prefer to make a sure and secure \$4 or \$5 or \$6 or \$7 a day in a factory than to take their chances on the growing of a crop that may be cut by the chinch bug or destroyed by the drought.

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank you for your elucidation of that remark of yours, because I thought it was rather sarcastic.

Mr. MONDELL. It was not intended to be so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Mondell, I gather from your statement and the opinions you have expressed—I have only heard a small part of your testimony, I am very sorry to say—that these industrial activities and high wages now being paid are such that the opportunities presented by this measure if it becomes a law, will attract more from the country than from the city; is that the idea?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I do not think that necessarily follows. It is true, I think, perhaps, although I do not know, I never saw any statistics and I do not imagine that any are available, but I assume it may be true that more men who at one time or another have lived on a farm return to farms than those from the towns and cities. However, some of the best farmers I have known have been men who grew to maturity and even to middle age in a city or a town and who had no acquaintance with farming up to that time. Many men get tired of the largely artificial life of a city or a large community. So that as to a thing of this kind I do not know whether a majority of the people who would take advantage of it would be men who had lived on farms or men who had lived in the cities.

If I were to venture a guess, I should say that there would be as many, if not more, men who are now in cities and large towns, and who would remain in large towns except for an opportunity like this, than there would be of men from the country, because I do not anticipate that the ordinary country boy who is going to inherit his father's farm or some part of it is probably going to seek this opportunity. The opportunities in their own community appeal to a great many country boys. They have friends who know them so well that they can secure extraordinary opportunities in the matter of borrowing and starting with but little in their own locality. Some of these same men, particularly from your country and from the mid-West, generally would seek opportunities on the newer lands of the West and Middle West; so if I were to venture a guess, I should say that more men would be attracted by this opportunity who are now in cities and in large towns than men who are now on and about farms.

Mr. WHITE. Now, I would like to ask you this question, making it as brief as I can: Instead of taking the instance suggested by yourself of a son of one of these farmers who might inherit his father's prop-

erty, let us take a case like this which might exist in 10,000 instances, where he will not inherit his father's farm on account of having a large family or misfortune overtaking him for 100 different reasons, over which the man would have no control—

Mr. TAYLOR (interposing). Or the son of a tenant farmer?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; or the son of a farm owner who might not inherit his father's farm on account of having a large family, or through sickness or through a number of reasons which I do not care to enumerate, and this soldier boy wants to take advantage of the very conditions you have delineated here so faithfully, but has not the capital, and who, possibly without any stretch of imagination, would have to go to the city or would, be inclined to go there, yet would much rather settle on 40 acres of land or 80 acres of land that are unused, as there are existing in thousands and tens of thousands of cases, the productivity of which land is well established, and in a locality where the boy is thoroughly familiar with the conditions and will have the counsel of his father and his friends, coming back with enlarged ideas, stimulated ambitions—

Mr. MAYS (interposing). And where his mother-in-law lives.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; or where she will live when he marries the girl. From the standpoint of solvency, Mr. Mondell, would the Government be as safe in lending that boy the percentage that might be fixed by law—and I will include another question if you will pardon me—would his prospects of success be equal to those who moved to a project which to him would be problematical and experimental.

Mr. MONDELL. I will be as brief as I can and try to answer that question. I think the earlier part of my statement, before you came in, covered in a way the thoughts that you have raised by your question and the conditions that you have suggested. The farmer boy who does not want to leave the home neighborhood is like the farmer boy who has stayed at home while all of his brothers have gone West in years past. If he is the right kind of a farmer boy and wants to buy a farm in that locality, there are abundant opportunities for him to get credit. He is known; men are acquainted with his ability and his honesty and his stability of purpose and his industry, and there are a thousand hands held out to him in the way of aid and assistance of one sort and another in acquiring property in the community or near where he is known. Now, when the Federal Government or any government legislates with a view to assisting that man who is to carve out his own fortune, who will be under no supervision, who will have no advice from those interested, from the governmental standpoint, it has not been deemed safe to depart from the purely business view that has developed with regard to that kind of loans. We passed a farm-loan act, the purpose of which was to help that kind of a boy.

It is possible that the farm-loan act is not sufficiently liberal or it might be made more liberal than it now is, safely, as applied to people generally. I do not know as to that. That is a matter that is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee, in any event. As I suggested, it is possible that the farm-loan act might be so amended as to afford loans to soldiers up to 100 per cent of the value of the property they purchase. In my opinion that would be unwise from my viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. One moment; I would like to state to the committee that I have just been informed that the previous question is being put on the wire-control bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Just one word in conclusion. In my opinion you can not enter upon that sort of enterprise with any hope or expectation of success. I do not think that in the great majority of cases you would either do the man a kindness or do an act which you could justify. You would find, as Australia did, that such attempts to aid were failures.

As I suggested during the early part of my discussion there are many States in this Union that are strong and powerful and that have funds at their command. There is a splendid opportunity for all of the States to enter upon just that kind of enterprise and do just that thing. I do not know why they should not do it, if they think it is safe. It has been suggested that the Federal Government might provide, through the farm loan act for a larger loan on property than now, in the case of soldiers, the State to furnish a certain percentage of the money and the Government, which furnished the greater portion of the money, to have the superior lien. If under the farm loan act the States and the Government want to enter into that kind of an agreement, there may be some argument for it. I do not think it would be wise. I do not think it would work out. I do not think it would help the soldier in the long run, but that is not before this committee.

Mr. WHITE. That is very interesting, Mr. Mondell, and I am pleased to have this a matter of record, and I am glad you have elucidated your ideas on that subject.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the statement that there has been a whole lot of concern expressed here for the man who wants to live in his own neighborhood. I have listened patiently to those expressions, and I have come to the conclusion that the concern is not so much for the soldier as it is for the community where he lives at the present time. I actually believe that these projects when they are started will appeal to the venturesome spirit of these men and they will want to leave, the big majority of them, and will take up a project of this kind. I think that would be true in my case.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Mondell, for your statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I beg your pardon for having taken up so much of your time, and I am under very great obligation to the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, is it understood that the hearings will absolutely be closed on Saturday?

The CHAIRMAN. It was moved and carried at the meeting yesterday that we would meet to-day and adjourn until Saturday, and it was understood that after hearing the delegation from New York on Saturday the hearings would be closed.

(The committee thereupon adjourned until Saturday, January 21, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, June 21, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have met this morning in pursuance to a request from Mr. Titus, of New York, asking that a delegation from New York be heard this morning, and, in accordance with the order made the other day, we will hear these gentlemen and close the hearings to-day. Mr. Titus, who is here to give testimony on behalf of your delegation?

Mr. TITUS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we have with us Mr. John D. Miller, of Susquehanna, Pa.; Mr. Charles D. Porter, of Orleans County, N. Y.; and Mr. F. A. Saulsbury, of Ontario County, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you wish each of them to be heard, or will some one speak for the entire delegation?

Mr. TITUS. I think that each one of these gentlemen would like to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we will be glad to hear you.

**STATEMENT OF MR. ELWOOD V. TITUS, PRESIDENT OF THE
NASSAU COUNTY (N. Y.) FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION.**

Mr. TITUS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Public Lands Committee, I represent the New York State Federation of Farm Bureaus, composed of upward of 60,000 members, who are real farmers of the State, and individually I represent the Nassau County Farm Bureau Association and the Suffolk County Farm Bureau Association. Suffolk County, as you gentlemen know, is on the eastern end of Long Island. We appear here in opposition to the Mondell bill, calling for the expenditure of several millions of dollars in the reclamation of swamp and arid lands to provide homes for the soldiers. But at the outset I want to explain to you my attitude in this matter. My desire is to do everything possible for the soldiers, and, in fact, I yield to no one in my desire to do everything possible to aid those heroic and patriotic young men of this country, many of whom sacrificed their lives, and others of whom risked their lives in order that you and I might live, and that this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth. I want you to understand that. I am here, perhaps, with an open mind, but on general principles we are opposed to the expenditure of this vast sum of money, especially at this time, when, as you know, we are burdened with a tremendous war debt. Another thing I wish to say to you is this: How many of those soldiers do you suppose want to go back on the farm? From a copy of the hearings that your illustrious chairman sent me, I note that some 52,000 replied that they did. Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the number at that time.

Mr. TITUS. They said they wanted to go back on the farms. Now, what does that mean? Personally I am opposed, and I believe that you gentleman are, to undertaking to put upon the farms any man

who has not had some farm training or some agricultural experience. Most of you gentlemen, I take it, know what it means to go on a farm and milk the cows and do all that sort of work for 365 days in the year, Sundays and all. I tell you that there are very few men in this country to-day that are willing to put up with that, notwithstanding the fact that we have modern milking machines and all those other modern appliances. There is another thing: Is it not a fact that in the Middle West to-day farmers are clamoring for help to aid them in harvesting the bumper crop of wheat and other cereals, and is it not a fact that they can not get the help? They are offering, as I understand it, from fifty to one hundred dollars per month and board, and yet if you will go into these big cities you will find that there are thousands of men walking around, big husky fellows in uniform, just returned from across the seas, who will not go out upon the farms. That is the condition that prevails in my own home town to-day. Our farmers are seeking help, and in our home village there are great husky men walking around with the uniform on, with the idea, judging from their expressions, that the world owes them a living without work. Now, no one would object to such a plan, and I say that I favor this country or this Government offering every inducement possible to aid in the location of the soldiers upon farms, if they want to go there and know something about it. How many of these men will make failures? They are simply replying to questions that are put to them. The answer, "Yes; I would like to farm," carries but little weight with me. How many men start out and make a living on farms who have not had any agricultural training? You know that from New York City many millionaires have gone out on Long Island to engage in the poultry business and in the dairy business. Of course, 99 per cent of them make failures.

I know of many men who have gone into that locality and who have spent thousands of dollars upon poultry plants, hoping to have a few hens and collect a few hundred eggs every day and sell them for \$1 per dozen, or something like that. Now, these are the reasons why we oppose this bill: We believe that it is unbusinesslike; we believe that it is impracticable, and we do not believe that any private individual would finance any such scheme as this, because of the fact that the results from it would be so problematical. Therefore we believe that it is unbusinesslike and impracticable for the United States Government to take up a scheme like this and spend vast sums of money upon it, especially at this time. We further claim that if there is any desire for lands on the part of soldiers, there are sufficient lands for them without spending so much money for their reclamation. Is it not a fact that in New York State and in New England there are hundreds, and I guess thousands of abandoned farms that can be bought to-day for 25 per cent less than the original dwelling houses on those places cost.

The CHAIRMAN. In New York State?

Mr. TITUS. In New York State, I think, and in New England as well. The Department of Agriculture, I think, has put out a document with a statement as to the farms for sale in New York State.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this [indicating] the document?

Mr. TITUS. I have a copy of it at home. Yes; that is one. What is the date of that?

The CHAIRMAN. December, 1915.

Mr. TITUS. I think that is about the date of it.

The CHAIRMAN. This list shows that there is a great deal of idle land in the State of New York.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir. Now, take the Middle West and the Southwest, and the Yazoo Valley in Mississippi. Is it not a fact that that is the most fertile land in this country, possibly with the exception of the Imperial Valley in California? My contention is that there is no necessity for this bill, involving this unusual expenditure of money. That is all I have to say.

Mr. WHITE. Referring to the lands you spoke about in the State of New York, could they, with moderate expense, be made profitable for agriculture?

Mr. TITUS. I believe that they could. If you will permit me to say further, as I understand it, the provisions of this bill call for certain centralized settlements or communities. It calls for a community plan, does it not? Now, I question the wisdom of this Government going into settlement work.

Mr. WHITE. You answered my question very satisfactorily, and I would like to ask one more, if you will pardon me: Why do you think that lands which are under cultivation and which are so very valuable now, and upon which the profits are said to be quite satisfactory, are not in demand? Why does there seem to be no demand for those lands?

Mr. TITUS. Why is it?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. TITUS. I admit that some of those farms are somewhat isolated. They are over a mile away from public schools, social activities, and all that; but in all my experience I never saw a good farm lying in a city. I never saw a farm in a city that was good for anything, and I always thought that farms belonged in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a good deal of idle land in your own country?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir; some.

The CHAIRMAN. On the plains there, or on what are called the plains?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There are idle farm lands all through the State of New York?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Especially on what is called the Volusia soil.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They have been run down on account of poor farming and neglect?

Mr. TITUS. Very largely.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what this bulletin issued by your State agricultural department states, and I get that also from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TITUS. Permit me to say further that I have had information from a very authoritative source that within two hours ride of the city of New York there are over 4,000,000 acres of tillable land available, and that one and a third million of those acres are ready for the plow to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. What could those lands be purchased for?

Mr. TITUS. I have no idea. For instance, you take lands on Long Island that are not so expensive—I might say in the vicinity of Hicksville—have you been in that vicinity?

The CHAIRMAN. I have been in the vicinity of the city of Mineola.

Mr. TITUS. This is three or four miles from Mineola. There was a farm there on which a man planted 205 acres of potatoes, and after the potatoes were up he sold 20 acres of that land for \$15,000. Of course lands are high, but that is ideal potato soil. Now, along this line, why is there a demand for so much additional land to-day to put soldiers on in view of the bumper crops of cereals that are in sight for the year 1919? Here is a little paper that the Department of Agriculture sends me weekly, which states that there are about 1,200,000 more brood sows in the United States than ever before, and that the farmers have in prospect a wheat crop of 1,260,000,000 bushels—in sight now. Is that right?

Mr. WHITE. The estimate is about 1,000,000,000 bushels. I want to ask you another question: You do not believe that your farmers fear any competition that might result from putting this legislation into operation, do you?

Mr. TITUS. Personally, I have no fear of it, because I believe that it will be largely a failure on the part of many of them. As I was saying, looking at the large crops in prospect, that exemplifies my contention that there is sufficient fertile land in this country to-day to provide for our 100,000,000 inhabitants and leave enough for export.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask you another question: When did this decadent condition that you spoke of, when the lands began to go down, commence? Did it begin after the Civil War, as a result of competition with the West?

Mr. TITUS. I would not like to be quoted as an authority on that matter, but my understanding is that it began along in the seventies. Is that right, Mr. Porter?

Mr. PORTER. I think so.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It began in the seventies.

The CHAIRMAN. You have in the State of New York about 215,000 farms, averaging about 102 acres each.

Mr. TITUS. It is about that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average price of those farms? Is the average about \$5,000?

Mr. TITUS. I can not say what the average would be for the whole State.

The CHAIRMAN. If your State got its proportion of the proposed appropriation, it would be about \$10,000,000?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That would buy about 2,000 farms in your State?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that would be a little less than 1 per cent of them?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not feel that that would bring on any undue or severe competition, do you?

Mr. TITUS. Personally I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke about the fact that you are opposed to the draining of swamp lands in the South and the irrigation of arid lands. Now, this bill is broader than that. This bill is not confined to swamp lands of the South nor arid lands of the West, but it is proposed to construct a project in each State, wherever there is one feasible; and, according to your testimony and the testimony of the bulletin put out by your Department of Agriculture, there is a great deal of land in the State of New York that might be utilized for the purpose.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the very cheapest land in the United States that might be secured is in the State of New York. This bulletin that you have referred to, and that was issued by the department of agriculture of the State of New York, says this:

The State needs more and better farmers, and it is to that class that this department particularly appeals, and to which the State will give a warm welcome.

That is true, is it not?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir. I know that there are efforts being made by organizations in the counties to induce farmers to locate in the several counties.

The CHAIRMAN. Then this bulletin states further—

In order to supply the demand for farm produce, every acre of land in this State capable of producing a profitable crop should be under cultivation, and undoubtedly will be within a few years.

Mr. FERRIS. What are you reading from, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I am reading from Bulletin No. 78 of the department of agriculture of the State of New York. It contains a list of farms for rent and sale in the State of New York. It seems to me that your State would be a pretty good State in which to take up some of these lands and to inaugurate on them one of these projects. Now, the former Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, after a tour of several days through portions of the State of New York, made this statement:

The cheapest farm lands in the United States to-day, with nearness to good markets, the price of land, and all other farm conditions considered, are east of the Alleghenies, and the low-priced farm lands of New York State are the best investments in America.

Do you agree with that?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This bulletin goes on to say on page 436:

The truth of Secretary Wilson's words is becoming more and more appreciated by the people of the whole country, as shown by their requests for information and their purchases of New York farms.

The CHAIRMAN. You agree with that?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from Mr. E. R. Lupton, president of the Suffolk County Farm and Home Bureau Association, which I would like to submit. Mr. Lupton was unable to be present. Shall I read it?

The CHAIRMAN. You may read it.

RIVERHEAD, N. Y., June 19, 1919.

Mr. E. V. TITUS,
Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TITUS: As I am unable to attend the hearing at Washington on the Lane plan for land reclamation for our soldiers, I am sending you the following statement giving reasons why the directors of the Suffolk County Farm and Home Bureau Association and a large majority of its 1,100 members and many of the other farmers of this vicinity are opposed to the plan as described in the newspapers:

"1. The development of new land, as cut-over swamp and arid land, is a slow and arduous process with a long period of waiting and discouragement before the land can become productive and profitable.

"2. There is a large element of uncertainty as to the proper methods of handling new land to render it productive, which the settler must meet without the guidance of an established practice to be observed upon the farms of successful neighbors.

"3. The problems of the agriculture suited to irrigated farms and drained swamps are highly complex, require large capital and are at variance with farming experience, which may have been acquired on general farms throughout the United States and are therefore unsuited to beginners in farming.

"4. The present time is unsuitable for undertaking such reclamation projects, because it is the time of highest cost for labor and materials for the work and because the need for food production is immediate and greater than it is likely to be when these farms begin to produce. The settler will incur maximum cost of development and begin to produce on a declining price scale.

"5. There is an abundance of good agricultural land in the East and South which may be obtained at low cost in terms of its productive capacity and may be quickly made productive by following agricultural practice well established and demonstrated on successful farms near by. The soldiers might be located on these farms at lower cost and with greater prospect of success."

The farmers of Suffolk County therefore believe that the expenditure of a smaller amount of money in assisting our soldiers to establish themselves on these so-called abandoned farms of the East and South—abandoned only because their owners have failed to adapt them to present-day conditions—will do more toward making successful and prosperous farmers than a much greater expenditure on extravagant reclamation schemes.

Yours, very truly,

E. R. LUPTON, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Titus, in Bulletin No. 60 of the United States Department of Agriculture I note this statement with reference to these Volusia soils in the State of New York, which stretch nearly across the State:

In the region occupied by the silt loam many farm homes are abandoned; the farm buildings are fast going to ruin; once productive fields are abandoned, so far as profitable agriculture is concerned. These fields are growing up to weeds, and, in a few cases, to a second growth of timber, worthless except for firewood. Many of these fields are not even being utilized for pasturage, and the present tenantry make only a poor living.

Then, on page 12, reference is made to the increase in population in that section as being something like 37 per cent. On page 22 they say that—

These soils constitute some of the cheapest farm land now on the market in the United States and their selling price in the majority of cases is below their actual agricultural value.

This bulletin goes on to say that those lands are not worn-out soils in any proper sense of the word, but that, so far as the mineral matter of the soil is concerned, they are abundantly supplied with the

plant-food elements for the production of good crops. It says further that the proper management and tillage of the soils require tile drainage over considerable areas, etc. This bulletin shows how those soils may be restored to their original fertility. Do you agree with all of that?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir; and that is what is claiming the attention of many of our scientists to-day, as you all know. They are trying to restore the fertility of worn-out soils. May I ask you if it is not a fact that out in the Dakotas and in some of the other States out in that region there are thousands of acres of valuable land that has been abandoned by farmers who have gone to Canada?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know of any such in the Dakotas.

Mr. TITUS. I have been told that. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the paramount duty of this committee is to recommend a continuance of the agitation for more intensive agriculture rather than extensive agriculture. You know as well as I do that in foreign countries—England, Belgium, Holland, France, and Denmark—the yields of cereals and potatoes are just about double what they are in this country. On potato soils in England they have grown potatoes since the occupation by the Romans. Now, why is that?

Mr. JOHNSON. I understand it to be the purpose of the committee here to work out some feasible plan for aiding soldiers. Can you not give the committee the benefit of your opinion or the information you have on this subject, so as to aid us in working out a feasible plan for aiding the returning soldiers?

Mr. TITUS. I would favor any effort on the part of this committee to place any soldier upon a farm who wants to go upon a farm. I believe, as I have said, and as has been indicated by the questions of your chairman, these abandoned farms could be utilized, and I would favor the expenditure of a small amount of money—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). How much?

Mr. TITUS. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON. About how much for each soldier?

Mr. TITUS. Well, now, that is something that I have not given any thought to, and you must excuse me from answering that. In a general way, however, I favor it. Now, there is another thing to be considered. Why are not these soldiers encouraged and assisted in going into some other kind of business as well as farming?

Mr. JOHNSON. We would like to have your ideas on that. We want your help.

Mr. TITUS. I am somewhat at sea on this matter, and the most that I came for was to oppose this vast expenditure of money at this time, with the burden that we are under. With the tremendous debt that we have, I would oppose entering upon an impracticable and unbusinesslike scheme that no private companies would finance.

Mr. SUMMERS. In regard to your statement that potatoes had been grown on certain soils in England since the time of the Roman occupation, are you not taking that back too far? Is not the potato indigenous to America? Were not potatoes introduced into England after the discovery of America?

Mr. TITUS. I think the potato originally came from Brazil, from the top of the Andes Mountains.

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, that is in America. You must make a little allowance, then, of about 2,000 years in your reference to the production of potatoes in England from the time of the Roman occupation.

Mr. TITUS. Perhaps I am mistaken there.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask this question: I have been wonderfully impressed with your statement, Mr. Titus, as to the availability of this New York land for farming purposes, and the letter which you have read into the record strongly alludes to the proposition of segregating these settlements. Having that in mind, I would like to present this concrete question: You seem to think, and I am frank to say, although it is not necessary for me to say, that I agree with you, that a man who starts out on a farm with the adequate experience that comes from a lifetime of training is the man who is most likely to succeed on the farm, and that where the soldier has had a farm training and experience he presents to the Government a more solvent proposition than one who has not had that training?

Mr. TITUS. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. If one of those young men in the Army who, we will say, is the son of a farmer and who has had experience on a farm all his life, comes back here and wants a farm, but has not capital to procure one, do you not think it would be a safe thing for the Government to lend him the necessary capital, or do you not think it would be a safe thing from the standpoint of solvency?

Mr. TITUS. I would want to put that young man on the witness stand and question him.

Mr. WHITE. We will say that he has the qualities that make for success. If such men were located on those farms that have been abandoned and that promised profitable returns, what do you think would be the result?

Mr. TITUS. About 25 per cent of them would succeed and about 75 per cent would fail.

Mr. WHITE. Do you think that such a man would give greater promise of success than he would if he were without any experience in farming?

Mr. TITUS. By far; yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. Would it be possible for the Secretary of the Interior and some of his assistants to exercise an intelligent discretion in securing men to go upon those farms?

Mr. TITUS. I should certainly think that that would be his paramount duty.

Mr. VAILE. Then, if that provision is made in this bill, the bill would not be open to the objection that it threw open the door indiscriminately to incompetent as well as competent men?

Mr. TITUS. No, sir; provided you do not undertake this scheme of spending \$5,000,000,000—I do not know how much money is involved, because when we farmers come to the word "billion" we become confused in our heads. We do not know where we are at.

Mr. VAILE. Do you realize that this bill does not propose any gift or gratuity to the soldiers?

Mr. TITUS. We realize that.

Mr. VAILE. It proposes to sell lands on certain reasonable terms. Was that point considered by your association?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir. What are the provisions of the Farm Loan Bank Act on this subject? Do you give much better terms in your bill than are given in the existing law?

Mr. VAILE. That is a question that has been raised here.

Mr. TITUS. That has been referred to.

Mr. VAILE. If the Government gets back in a few years such money as has been invested in these projects, would this bill, containing such a provision, be objectionable to your association as involving the expenditure of a large amount of money?

Mr. TITUS. I am opposed to the expenditure of a large amount of money if the situation does not warrant it. If there is a demand that warrants it, no one would concur in such a plan more quickly than I.

Mr. VAILE. Do you believe that there is too much food produced now?

Mr. TITUS. No, sir; not when we have to feed a lot of people abroad.

Mr. VAILE. Your statement with regard to excessive crops is not entire applicable to this inquiry, is it?

Mr. TITUS. Of course, when we get back to normal times that may be true, but we are living now under extraordinary conditions incident to the long war. When South America, Australia, and all of those countries get back to normal conditions, and shipping gets back to normal conditions, the situation will be different. What would be the price of wheat to-day if there was not a Government guaranty under such conditions, with no demand for it, and with this immense crop at hand?

Mr. WHITE. Wheat is away above the guaranty.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir; but it is due to conditions abroad.

Mr. WHITE. Not altogether.

Mr. SUMMERS. Wheat was \$1 per bushel above the guaranteed price at the time the guaranty was first fixed.

Mr. TITUS. I have so much faith in the American farmer that I believe that so long as he has a reasonable show of a fair profit on his crops—hogs, wheat, corn, and everything else—there is no danger of the people starving to death.

Mr. VAILE. Your association would be favorable, would it not, to a reasonable expenditure by the Government, not in the form of a gift, but as an investment to establish soldiers upon farms in your State, would it not?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir; if there was a demand for it in this State or any other. That would be true if there was a demand for it.

Mr. VAILE. Assuming that there is such a demand as that for farm lands in your own State, I will ask you whether your association has such an objection to the development of lands in the West and South that it would refuse to take the benefits of this act as applied to the State of New York?

Mr. TITUS. We would make no distinction between the East and West. I have seen the statement in the papers that this is to boom the West, etc.

Mr. VAILE. I think you are under a mistaken impression.

Mr. TITUS. I do not think that is true. I would not say that.

Mr. VAILE. That is what we want to get at. As the chairman stated the other day, the poison has been spread among the people that this is a western scheme. They tell the western people that it is a scheme to reclaim swamp lands in the South, and they tell southern men that it is a scheme to reclaim arid lands in the West. They tell eastern men that it is a western and southern scheme to reclaim swamp lands and irrigate arid lands. Has your association considered the proposition that it applies equally to all parts of the United States?

Mr. TITUS. I will say that our executive committee has not, but personally I have.

Mr. VAILE. Will you be good enough to impress upon your executive committee that this does apply to all parts of the United States?

Mr. TITUS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to the demand for more farm produce, this bulletin issued by the department of agriculture of the State of New York says that the State is increasing in population about 116,000 annually, and then it has this statement, which I shall read:

In order to supply the demand for farm produce, every acre of land in this State capable of producing a profitable crop should be under cultivation, and undoubtedly will be within a few years.

Bulletin No. 64, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, refers to the abandoned farms in the State of New York in this way:

Among the important causes of the decline of agriculture in this region has been the lack of sufficient capital to make the necessary improvements, to purchase needed equipment, and hire sufficient and competent labor.

Then on page 7 of this same bulletin is this statement:

Enough evidence is at hand to support the belief that the agricultural conditions existing in southern New York are not necessary, and that they are the results of poor or indifferent management. As pointed out in Bulletin 60 of the Bureau of Soils, the problem of soil improvement is purely one of a system of managements.

On page 17 of this same bulletin this statement occurs:

The opportunity to establish a practical and successful system of management on lands which can be purchased at remarkably low prices is great. Many farms can be purchased for less money than the buildings are worth. A small amount of capital will go a long way. These lands are not infertile and respond quickly to good management.

Then, there is the conclusion that the run-down condition of the land in southern New York is due primarily to the misuse of the soil, etc. Do you agree with that?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Are you a farmer yourself?

Mr. TITUS. I have been a farmer for about 60 years, and I am a farmer now, although my farm is reduced to about $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres. However, I still raise a few peas and vegetables in my garden. I have done my bit, it seems to me.

Mr. MAYS. Have you been a successful farmer?

Mr. TITUS. Moderately successful, or fairly so.

Mr. MAYS. You have stated two or three times that personally you oppose this bill because you fear competition from the soldiers in agriculture as affecting those already in the business. Does your association take the same position that you do upon that question, that they fear competition?

Mr. TITUS. Practically they do. I might qualify that statement: Where those soldiers proved within two or three years to be successful farmers there would be the danger of competition, but personally I believe that so many of them will make failures of it, and will run away from the farms to go into the cities among the bright lights and excitement of the cities, that it would not be serious. I believe that many of them would quit the farms.

Mr. MAYS. The farms would then be available for somebody else.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir; so they would.

Mr. MAYS. Does New York State produce what it consumes in the way of food supplies?

Mr. TITUS. I do not think it does.

Mr. MAYS. It imports the larger proportion of its food supply, does it not?

Mr. TITUS. I do not know about the larger proportion, but it does import in great quantities. As a farmer, I would say that I have plowed and harrowed behind a team of oxen many a day. We did not have recreation fields and community associations to teach boys how to play ball and other games, but the boys had to work in those days, and I think they were a blamed sight better off. I believe in a certain amount of recreation, but I believe that the best men in this country started to work when they were boys about 5 years of age.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you want your boy to have as hard a time as you had?

Mr. TITUS. No, sir; but I am as well off, and, perhaps, better off than some of the present rising generation who have been born with silver spoons in their mouths will be.

Mr. MAYS. Do you not believe that it is desirable to relieve the congestion in the large cities as much as possible?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir. Now, there is one more important point, if you will permit me. In 1916 there were 247 farmer boys, or farmers' sons, who left the farms of Nassau County to take up their life work along other lines.

Mr. MAYS. Did they better their condition?

Mr. TITUS. Some of them did, but I do not know about all of them. Nassau County is probably the smallest county in the State. We have only 1,037 farms in Nassau County, but 247 boys left those farms to go into the cities. Would you not view that situation with some alarm? I take it that that condition prevails all over the country to some extent.

Mr. MAYS. Does not that emphasize the necessity of taking some action to encourage the building up of farms?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. You would not allow that tendency to proceed indefinitely, would you?

Mr. TITUS. It is alarming. I do not know what the result of all this will be, but I view it with considerable alarm.

Mr. SUMMERS. Did your association take into consideration that the expenditure of the \$500,000,000 proposed in this bill would be extended over a period of several years, and that it would not be an immediate draft to that extent upon the Treasury?

Mr. TITUS. Did not the bill call for an initial appropriation of \$100,000?

Mr. SUMMERS. There are other bills.

Mr. FERRIS. The bill last year provided for \$100,000,000 and this bill provides for \$500,000,000.

Mr. MAYS. \$100,000 was expended.

Mr. FERRIS. That was for investigations.

Mr. SUMMERS. Is it not a fact that soil erosion and the overgrowth on these abandoned farms are every year making the reclamation of those farms more difficult?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. Would you think it safe to let that condition proceed indefinitely? Have you a plan to suggest whereby at the time you are reclaiming such lands you will be relieving the congestion in the cities and providing employment and homes for returning soldiers, or have you a better plan to suggest than that?

Mr. TITUS. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Titus, these gentlemen who are with you tell me that they have to appear before another committee, and they want to make brief statements before they leave.

Mr. PORTER. We are perfectly willing for Mr. Titus to remain here until you get through with him. I think we all indorse what Mr. Titus has been saying. We indorse the questions and answers, or practically all that have been asked and answered. Mr. Miller, of Susquehanna, Pa., would like to address the committee for two or three minutes.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN D. MILLER, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE, SUSQUEHANNA, PA.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am the vice president and am here as the representative of the Dairymen's League, an organization of 75,000 dairy farmers scattered throughout the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. I can only take about two minutes, but I will be glad to return later and answer any questions. My first thought, gentlemen, is that this subject naturally divides itself into two branches, first, what is best for the returning soldier, to whom we owe so much, and, second, what is best for the public good. We are here before you with some knowledge of farm conditions and of the result of people going from other vocations in the cities to the farms. Now, in proffering this invitation to the returning soldiers to go out upon the farms, you are inviting them to another siren country, and my advice to them would be to purchase a considerable supply of wax. It is unworkable—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You would do like Ulysses?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. Now, as to the development and the general good of all the people, which, as I take it from the questions you gentlemen have asked, is an increase of the food supply, I say to you that the ultimate working out of this plan will not result in an increased food supply for this country. These questions can not be regulated by arbitrary governmental actions, but they must be regulated by the inexorable law of supply and demand. If temporarily the quantity of farm products is increased, then the law of supply and demand will reduce the price on those farm products. That will result in a high cost of production and in the farmers going out of business. If these new farms constitute a part of the high cost of production, they will cease, but if they have a lesser cost of production, it means that in other sections the high cost of production farms will go out of business, and so the final result of your effort will be that you will have a shifting area of production. I think that is all I have to say, and I thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. F. A. SAULSBURY, PRESIDENT OF ONTARIO COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION, PHELPS, N. Y.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. Chairman, the question has been brought up here in regard to food production. I live up in central New York, where we are growing quite a large quantity of cabbages, my county being one of the largest cabbage-growing counties in New York. We also grow quite a large area of potatoes, together with carrots and other vegetables to a certain extent. I want to say that last year in our section there were hundreds of acres of cabbages that were not harvested because of the fact that the farmer could not secure their value. They would not pay the expense of harvesting and marketing them. Of course, it was a bad season.

Mr. WHITE. How many acres were lost?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Several hundred acres.

Mr. WHITE. Last year?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes, sir. While we are not a wheat-growing section, especially at the present time, last year the wheat crop did not produce enough to pay the expense of growing it. Of course, that was due to unfavorable climatic conditions which we do not always have. We are in a fairly good farming section, and usually produce a bountiful wheat crop. One thing that I can not quite get through my head is this: I believe I am as much in favor of helping the soldier as anyone, and we have a young man who was in the Army on our farm at the present time getting his first experience in practical farming, and he will buy a farm when he can. He is trying to do that. While I am a farmer and live on a farm, and will have to meet that competition if this plan is carried out, it seems to me that some of that money ought to be loaned to men to aid them in starting grocery stores, wool factories, and other business. It seems to me that other men, as well as the farmer, ought to have to meet this competition. Perhaps I am too practical, but that is the way I look at it. I thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES D. PORTER, PRESIDENT OF ORLEANS COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION, ALBION, N. Y.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to say a word in regard to those neglected farms in New York State. Those farms are in that condition at the present time for the reason that there has not been available help to work the farms as they ought to be worked. Those abandoned farms, or a lot of them, were owned by families, and the families have been broken up, as the boys have gone to the cities, leaving the old people, and they can not get help. The result is that the farms are neglected. If a scheme could be devised by which there could be some help secured by sending soldiers to help on the farms or if in some way there could be some help provided, there would not be as many neglected farms as there are to-day. The question has been asked, "What do you suggest?" We all agree that we want to take care of the soldiers. We want to take care of all the soldiers, and we do not want to pick out some soldiers whom we think might farm and put them on farms. If they have no experience or training as farmers, it would not be any help to put them on farms, but it would be like tying a millstone about their necks. If we want to help them, why not make an appropriation and have it allotted among the States, requiring the States to meet that appropriation with a like appropriation, and then have the States, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior, perhaps, work out the problem, and not only get the men on the farms, but give them help in some other businesses that they might want to carry on instead of farming? That would help all of the soldiers, and the States would be interested in financing it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Have you any idea of the value of those abandoned lands in New York State?

Mr. PORTER. The values vary, and, of course, some farms are worth more than others, but it has been stated that most of those farms can probably be bought to-day for less money than it would take to build the buildings and fences that are now on the farms.

Mr. FERRIS. What would that be per acre?

Mr. PORTER. That would probably be about \$50 per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there not some much cheaper than that?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir; there are some cheaper than that.

Mr. NICHOLS. How large would those tracts be?

Mr. PORTER. Anywhere from 50 acres up.

Mr. NICHOLS. How far up?

Mr. PORTER. I do not know that I can answer that question.

Mr. NICHOLS. About how would they run?

Mr. PORTER. From 100 acres to 150 acres, and there are some farms of 200 acres or more.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think it would be possible in the State of New York to get a tract of 10,000 acres altogether?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir; I would not be surprised.

The CHAIRMAN. In Bulletin No. 60 of the United States Department of Agriculture I find this statement on page 11:

The first of these farms sold in 1883 for \$37.50 an acre, while in 1909 the second farm, which is neither better nor worse, was sold for about \$5 per acre. A number of farms have recently been sold in this same region for taxes, and brought only a few dollars per acre.

Mr. PORTER. I know of some farms that were bought in Oswego County, adjoining Lake Ontario, some years ago. One of my neighbors bought one of those farms for \$7.50 per acre. It had quit a large orchard on it, but it was a neglected farm and was bought, as I say, for about \$7.50 per acre. Within a few years, he was raising \$5-a-barrel apples on that farm, and lots of them.

Mr. MAYS. You stated that you were in favor of having some plan for aiding the soldiers by which they would be sent out to the farms to work.

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Would you regard that as pretty substantial assistance?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Do you know to-day what the farmers in New York are paying for help?

Mr. PORTER. I know what they are paying in some parts. I know that they are paying what amounts to \$100 per month and more.

Mr. MAYS. Would you have the Government to pay a portion of those wages?

Mr. PORTER. The farmer would.

Mr. MAYS. Would you have the Government to act as an agency to secure help for the farmers?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir. These farms are equipped with tenant houses, and the workers would have good homes, good gardens, and all that sort of thing, in addition to the wage, which would run anywhere from \$900 to \$1,000 a year.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman who preceded you thought that this would impose unfair competition upon the farmers in their business.

Mr. PORTER. In regard to competition, of course I would not fear competition from farms that might be taken up in certain locations, because the men who would be located on those farms would give up before they could produce very much as compared with the farms already organized. I believe that if they took up these abandoned farms—and of course we do not figure that all of them will be taken up—but if some of them are taken up, there will be some farmers who will be industrious and successful, but I do not believe that that competition would be unfair.

Mr. MAYS. If there were opportunities to secure tracts such as you suggested awhile ago of 10,000 acres or more, or tracts large enough to place a project upon, would you object to that sort of project in your State?

Mr. PORTER. If it was carried on in the right form I would not, but I would object seriously to have it taken out of the hands of the State government. I think the State government should handle this proposition and should help select the farms and the men.

Mr. MAYS. Do you understand the provisions of this Mondell Bill?

Mr. PORTER. I have not read that bill.

Mr. MAYS. Then, you are not sure that you would oppose that bill after you had read it?

Mr. PORTER. I would oppose the bill that I did read.

Mr. MAYS. But you did not read the Mondell bill?

Mr. PORTER. No, sir. Furthermore, I did not come here for the purpose of appearing before this committee, and I was unprepared along those lines.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you force those boys to go out on the farms and work, or those that the gentleman who preceded you said were walking around the streets wearing the uniform?

Mr. PORTER. That is true in New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. How would you put them out on the farms?

Mr. PORTER. I do not know how you would put them out there.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are in favor of doing something for the soldiers?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. All of these people seem to be in favor of that. If that is true, why do you not come here with some constructive suggestions to help us meet that problem, rather than coming here with a series of knocks? Anybody can knock, but what we are looking for is something that is feasible to do for the soldiers. We would like to hear some constructive suggestions with that end in view.

Mr. PORTER. In reply to that question, I would suggest that personally I have not had time to look up this bill. I did not know that there was such a bill pending.

Mr. TITUS. May I be permitted to ask Mr. Porter a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TITUS. This is in line with a remark that was brought out. Mr. Porter states that the soldiers should be working on the farms. I do not know what the situation is in the Western States, but I live within 6 or 7 miles of Camp Mills and within 30 or 40 miles of Camp Upton. Camp Mills is in the center of the truck region of Nassau County, and they are offering men sixty and seventy dollars per month, but I do not believe that more than 10 soldiers have gone to work on farms, and those that did go did not stay 24 hours.

Mr. PORTER. Our farmers are offering \$3 per day and board to soldiers or anybody else they can get to do their work, but they can not get the help.

Mr. SUMMERS. Take such a tract of land as you have described to be bought at a very reasonable price, or was bought, in fact, at a reasonable price within three years——

Mr. PORTER (interposing). I think that was within five years. Time goes fast.

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, five years. You say it was a very productive and very profitable farm. Now, would it be any mistake to put soldiers on such farms as that, or help soldiers to procure homes like that in New York?

Mr. PORTER. If the soldier was made of the proper material, it would not be.

Mr. SUMMERS. If it would not be in New York, it ought not to be in any other State, ought it?

Mr. PORTER. Not if the conditions were the same.

Mr. MAYS. New York soldiers are generally made of the proper material, are they not?

Mr. PORTER. Most of them are.

Mr. SUMMERS. I want to say, further, that in considering a proposition of this kind, you should bear in mind that the State government cooperates and that a representative of the governor's chair helps in the selection of the projects, so that there is cooperation, as you will find when you read the Mondell bill, between the State and the Department of the Interior in locating and carrying out these projects.

Mr. PORTER. Does this bill call for a like amount or any amount of funds to come from the States?

Mr. SUMMERS. No; it does not, but it provides that if the State cooperates to the extent of 25 per cent, they then have greater rights in the proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. They will not select anything except it is approved and advocated by the Government.

Mr. PORTER. My experience has been that where there is money invested in a proposition, whatever it may be, and the people who are interested have money in the proposition, it is more likely to be a success than where they do not have money invested; therefore I believe it is highly important that this bill provide that the States should match any amount of money that it is decided shall be allotted to the States. For instance, if \$100,000 was allotted to New York State, New York State should match that \$100,000.

Mr. SUMMERS. Do you believe New York State would do that?

Mr. PORTER. We are doing it on extension work right straight along. We are matching to-day in New York State all the funds that come from the Lever bill and the special funds that are provided for extension farm work. We are matching that and going nearly \$100,000 better than the Federal Government is putting into our State, besides what we are getting for our county supervisors.

Mr. SUMMERS. My State of Washington has appropriated \$500,000 per annum for 10 years for just this sort of work, and I should think the great State of New York could afford to do as well.

Mr. PORTER. Well, I think the State of New York would come forward on a proposition of this kind if it is properly done.

Now, I am sorry I have got to go at this time, but I am due over at the Senate committee at 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Porter, I hope you will banish from your mind the bogie man that this is solely a scheme to drain the swamp lands of the South and irrigate the arid lands of the West.

Mr. PORTER. I am glad that this bill does not contemplate that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not solely intended nor solely permitted.

Mr. TITUS. We have another hearing this morning before the Senate committee on the reduction of the appropriation which would curtail the work of the counties all through the country. I was down here last week on this matter and I tried to see your worthy chairman at that time, but failed to do so, and so immediately on my return home I wrote a letter—

Mr. MAYS (interposing). What did you say it would curtail?

Mr. TITUS. The work of the county agents in the various counties.

Mr. FERRIS. Are these county agents that spoke here this morning?

Mr. TITUS. No, sir; not one of them is. Mr. Saulsbury is president of the Ontario County Farm Bureau; Mr. Porter is from Orleans, and Mr. Miller represents—he is vice president or secretary of the Dairymen's League.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Titus, I would like to ask you a question—first, pursuing the thought just a little farther—a question was asked by the gentleman at your right, Mr. White, and you stated that not all of the farmer boys would succeed on a farm in their own community. How would that percentage of successes or failures, in your judgment, of the farm boys of your community, compare—located on a farm in

their own community—with the project system which would locate them in about 99 per cent of the cases away from home? That is, in which case would the percentage of successes, in your judgment, be greater? This bill proposes to take the boy away from his home.

Mr. TITUS. Well, it would be greater where they would be allowed to remain on the farm at home.

Mr. VAILE. What would be greater?

Mr. TITUS. The percentage of successes.

Mr. BENHAM. In his local community or away from home?

Mr. TITUS. In his local community. Of course, there would be isolated cases—exceptions.

Mr. BENHAM. One other question, Mr. Titus. It is a sort of a harmless joke of some of the members of this committee to make it appear to the witness from any State that this project will, of course, furnish numerous projects in his home State. His home State is always a favored State. Now, as an actual fact, judging by the years that have gone, taking into account also the fact that the head of the Interior Department is from the extreme West; that the director general is also from the extreme West——

Mr. SUMMERS (interposing). Pardon me, Mr. Benham, to whom do you refer?

The CHAIRMAN. Director Davis is from Illinois.

Mr. BENHAM. Was from Illinois; is from farther West.

The CHAIRMAN. From where?

Mr. BENHAM. Well, that is a question that we can take up later.

Mr. SUMMERS. He has been in this service for 37 years.

Mr. BENHAM. He testified before this committee that his interests are largely in California and have been for the last several years.

Mr. VAILE. Would be lodged there; that is what he testified.

Mr. BENHAM. Well, I have the floor, I believe—also that the gentleman, the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service, who has appeared before this committee, Mr. Corey, is from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Indiana is his State.

Mr. BENHAM. I understand. Now I can go into that just as much as you want to, Mr. Chairman. Thirty-seven years ago he was from Indiana, and I may say for the benefit of the chairman and others that since it is a joke on Indiana, 70 Members of the present Congress are in the same sense from Indiana that Mr. Corey is from Indiana, and hence, pursuing the thought a little further, the membership of this committee, four of them, as you will observe, are from California, and in fact we people from the Middle West are put in only as a sort of ballast.

Taking into account the experience of the past and the fact that the Interior Department will have the last word as to where these projects are to be located, what will be the effect—that is, where will these projects probably be located?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Benham, your premises are not correct, in that the Interior Department is going to have the last say on the location of these projects.

Mr. BENHAM. In what respect am I misrepresenting the truth, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Why, the Congress of the United States has the last say.

Mr. VAILE. Of which you are a distinguished Member.

Mr. BENHAM. The bill doesn't say so.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I assume that the Appropriations Committee will consider the appropriation for each project.

Mr. BENHAM. Well, I have asked a question of Mr. Titus, and I am stating the facts that the bill justifies and that the author of the bill expounded and that the chairman of the committee and the gentleman on his right in their remarks have justified.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't think you have, Mr. Benham, because projects are selected, and they are subject to the approval or disapproval of Congress.

Mr. BENHAM. As an actual fact, how much will Congress know about an individual project? Are we expected to go out to each individual project and investigate it?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that you will know nothing about it when the matter is presented to Congress and full hearing are had on each project and on each proposed expenditure of money? There will be full hearings on each individual project.

Mr. BENHAM. On each individual project you understand Congress will have a full hearing on each individual project?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; on each individual project.

Mr. BENHAM. How much more will Congress be able to do than to attend these hearings on these individual projects?

Mr. SUMMERS. Those hearings would probably come before the Appropriations Committee, would they not?

The CHAIRMAN. They would come in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Appropriations Committee will go into every one of them before they appropriate a dollar.

Mr. BENHAM. They will have an immense job on their hands; that is all I have got to say, if this thing amounts to anything. It must, after all, be left to the testimony of a representative of the Interior Department. We have the testimony only of gentlemen representing the Interior Department.

The CHAIRMAN. They are doing that to-day on the reclamation projects. The hearings are very voluminous.

Mr. BENHAM. It is not possible for this Congress to go out and inspect—it is not supposed that the members of Congress will go out and visit these projects and pass judgment on them.

The CHAIRMAN. They have done that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Appropriations Committee goes out and goes over every one of them. I have been over both of them in my State with the committee.

Mr. BENHAM. I think that is another of your harmless jokes.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I have gone right with them. The Appropriations Committee goes and looks at them and goes all over them. I rode from one end to the other of those projects in Colorado with the committee, myself.

Mr. BENHAM. It is absolutely and entirely impossible and ridiculous to advance that theory about all these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to hear this gentleman. Let him say anything he wants to, and then interrogate him after he gets through.

Mr. TITUS. Gentlemen, I haven't anything further to say, only this—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Mr. Benham asked a question.

Mr. TITUS. Excuse me; what was it?

Mr. BENHAM. I don't seem to get anywhere with my questions, Mr. Chairman, without, not a discussion with the witness, but a discussion with the members of this committee, so I guess it is not necessary. I will have my say a little later.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. Well, I think you should state your question, Mr. Benham, distinctly, so that the witness can understand it.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Smith, I think the witness understands it, but I don't think you understand it.

Mr. VAILE. Let us all keep silent now while he states the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Mr. Titus, you are at the disposal of Mr. Benham. Mr. Benham, you may proceed.

Mr. BENHAM. Well, Mr. Chairman, will the members of the committee allow this talk to proceed between the witness and myself? If I don't have the floor I don't care to attempt it.

The CHAIRMAN. If you don't wish to be interrupted you may proceed.

Mr. BENHAM. I don't want more than six members of the committee to jump in at once and try to interfere.

You are fairly well acquainted with the reclamation projects of the Interior and other departments of the Government for the past several years, as to where they are located?

Mr. TITUS. Tolerably so; yes, sir. I have traveled a few times—three times—across the continent.

Mr. BENHAM. And you are entirely familiar with the many reclamation projects in the various States, are you?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENHAM. And in New York and in the East and Middle West there are many, don't you think, reclamation projects that the Government is carrying on successfully?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENHAM. Well, it is a fact that the gentlemen, according to this bill, who will have the last word, are members of the Interior Department. Now, judging by the experience of the past, where the projects have been located and the personnel and the location of the gentlemen who will have the last word on their location, do you assume that that will have a tendency to take the farm labor away from the State of New York or bring it back to the State of New York—that is, the reclamation projects, the soldier-helping projects, so called?

Mr. TITUS. I am fearful that it would draw some of it away. Now, that particular point, as I say, I had given thought to. It seems to me, gentlemen, that this is a most serious question, and I know that this committee are doing their very level best to act in the proper line toward the returning soldier. It seems to me that the thought of the thinking men of this country should be concentrated in some way—those men of experience in farming matters—on this one subject, that the best results may be obtained.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you through, Mr. Benham?

Mr. BENHAM. I suppose so.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I want you to be through. I don't want to interrupt anybody.

You spoke awhile ago of the competition with the farmer and farm labor being interfered with; that the soldier in your section would not work on the farm. Don't you think that that labor could be supplied by inducing the southern negroes to go up there and take their places?

Mr. TITUS. Thirty years ago we had nothing but southern Negro labor in our locality; to-day there are very few of them, and isn't it a fact that the Middle West, Kansas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, has been depending very largely upon the Negro laborer of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and they have gone out there at the instance of some of these intelligence bureaus on the promise of immense wages and nothing to do, and have remained there a year or two, and have then returned to their native heath? Isn't that fact, gentlemen?

Mr. JOHNSON. I really don't know.

Mr. TITUS. Now, we have tried that in our locality, and I will tell you there are very few southern Negro laborers working on Long Island to-day. I do know of a few instances. They work there until snow begins to fly, along early in December, and then you see them shoot off down South, and when the sun begins to shine on both sides of the fence, they come back again.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, wouldn't you be in favor of inducing them to come back?

Mr. TITUS. If possible, I certainly should, but you know it is like pulling teeth to get a Negro away from the South. I have been all through the South, and I was wonderfully impressed, and it made a deep and sad impression upon me, the condition of the southern Negro as to illiteracy, immorality, and everything else in those Southern States.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Titus, in answer to a leading question by Mr. Benham, you expressed some apprehension that the farm laborers—that is, the hired man on the farm—in New York and other Eastern States might be attracted to these new opportunities which would be afforded by opening up these new projects.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are you opposed to giving the returning soldier who is a farm laborer, a hired man on the farm, an opportunity to get a home, to own a farm?

Mr. TITUS. I am not opposed to it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does not this afford an opportunity for him to do it?

Mr. TITUS. But I don't know that I make my thoughts and my position clear to you, gentlemen. I favor this Government doing everything possible to aid these returning soldiers in one way or another.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will not this plan do it?

Mr. TITUS. But this plan—I don't think the Government is warranted in spending so much money on a plan of reclamation, the result of which would be so problematical. Understand me, I favor helping these soldiers.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You admit that you can not help them in your own locality to get back to the farm; now, we are proposing something that will afford them an opportunity. If you are in favor

of helping them get back into agricultural pursuits, why not support this bill?

Mr. TITUS. Because I believe, in a general way, that there is sufficient untilld land in this country to supply the needs.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What is your solution, Mr. Titus, of the problem of the high cost of living, which is so seriously affecting every wage earner in the country? What is your solution of that problem?

Mr. TITUS. It is a pretty knotty question.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I know, but it is a question that confronts this committee and Congress.

Mr. TITUS. I am well aware of that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We are hoping that this legislation would tend to solve that problem by encouraging agricultural development.

Mr. TITUS. I am afraid that no relief will come from this legislation.

Mr. SUMMERS. I would like to ask Mr. Titus two questions.

There has been some reference made to the great danger of taking a young man away from his home and putting him down on another farm somewhere else. Isn't it a fact that the farmers west of the Mississippi are as prosperous as any farmers in the United States?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. Isn't it a fact that 75 per cent of those farmers are men who did that very thing, left their native State and went to a new country and developed a farm and are still living during the first generation after they moved?

Mr. TITUS. A large number of them did, but hardly the percentage you state.

Mr. SUMMERS. What percentage would you say?

Mr. TITUS. Twenty-five per cent.

Mr. SUMMERS. Twenty-five per cent of them that went from States east of the Mississippi?

Mr. TITUS. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS. Where did the others come from?

Mr. TITUS. I don't know.

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, they came from some place.

Mr. TITUS. They came from some place; yes.

Mr. SUMMERS. And they went on to soil with which they were not familiar.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. And if they did that, with some encouragement and some help on the part of the Government, why should we believe that our returned soldiers can not do the same and establish prosperous homes for themselves?

Mr. TITUS. Well, human nature, to my mind, has changed somewhat since the pioneers went west of the Mississippi. Those men would endure hardships and did endure hardships which the young men of this generation will balk at. Isn't that right, Mr. Chairman, to a large extent?

Mr. SUMMERS. In that connection I would like to take that into consideration. The Government is in this bill proposing to make it possible for them to establish homes without having undergone as many hardships as these pioneers that you speak of have undergone.

Mr. TITUS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. SUMMERS. And that is exactly what it proposes, and the greatest thing, in my mind, that it does propose.

Mr. TITUS. It might be sufficient inducement to a great many.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask Mr. Titus one more question.

Mr. Titus, have you observed that as a result of the returning soldiers there is any oversupply of labor in your State, either in town or out?

Mr. TITUS. An oversupply?

Mr. WHITE. Of labor; yes.

Mr. TITUS. No, sir; there is an undersupply—a great shortage of labor.

Mr. WHITE. You honestly believe there is an undersupply of labor in the State of New York at this time?

Mr. TITUS. I do. What do the statistics show?

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a clipping from yesterday's Washington Star, June 19, 1919:

LABOR SURPLUS IN UNITED STATES SHOWS MARKED INCREASE—JUMPS FROM 227,777 FOR WEEK ENDED JUNE 7 TO 241,046 FOR THE SAME PERIOD TO 14TH INSTANT.

The labor surplus in the United States jumped from 227,777 for the week ending June 7 to 241,046 for the week ending June 14, according to the latest report of the United States Employment Service issued today.

Reports were received from 100 cities. Of these 48 report the surplus, while 19 cities report a shortage of labor amounting to 12,765, which compares with a shortage last week of 9,618 reported by 15 cities. This week 33 cities report an equality compared with 12 cities last week and 48 the week before.

Of the 38 States reporting, 21 show a surplus of labor, 9 an equality, and 10 report the above shortage. New York again reports a surplus of 100,000.

Mr. TITUS. May I say that I misinterpreted the gentleman's question. That applies to all lines of industry, that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TITUS. I thought that this gentleman here (Mr. White) referred to the farm labor.

Mr. WHITE. No; I meant general conditions, as far as you were able to speak, in the State.

Mr. TITUS. Well, I was not cognizant of the situation in general.

Mr. MAYS. Well, there is a million more soldiers to be returned yet, or nearly that, to civil life, isn't there?

Mr. TITUS. Yes; a whole lot more.

Mr. MAYS. That will tend to add to the surplus of labor?

Mr. TITUS. Yes; it will.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask you two or three questions, Mr. Titus.

You are in favor of the basic proposition of doing something for the soldier?

Mr. TITUS. I am.

Mr. TAYLOR. And all these organizations associated with you in this protest are in favor of doing something, aren't they?

Mr. TITUS. Practically all of them; yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. The whole American people are in favor of doing something for the soldier?

Mr. TITUS. I think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. And they are looking to Congress to do something, aren't they?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, two-thirds of them are already discharged.

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have been fiddling along about this thing for months and months; people are getting impatient; soldiers are getting impatient; they feel that if we are ever going to do anything we ought to do something. Now, as a thoughtful man, as you are, why haven't you been thinking about the lines of construction instead of along the lines of destruction? And why don't you come here before this committee with some concrete proposition to help the returning soldiers and help this committee in doing what the American people want us to do and what we are trying to do here, and give us some suggestions worthy of our consideration—you and all these organizations that have come before the committee?

Mr. TITUS. That is a very pertinent question to ask, I admit.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, will you answer it?

Mr. TITUS. I confess I can't answer it at this time, but I will tell you what I will do, if it is the desire of this committee I will communicate with this committee in the very near future about that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, let me suggest this Mondell bill is no new thing; it has been worked out for months and months and months: we don't propose that it is to be a panacea for everything under the sun, or bring about the millennium, but every nation in the world is trying to do something for the soldiers; all the English-speaking people are doing something right along this particular line, and they are doing ten times more than this. Now, why shouldn't we adopt this measure, even if there are some other measures that ought also to be adopted by other committees in the way of loaning money or advancing money or something of that kind? Why shouldn't we do something of this kind and bring in this unused and abandoned land throughout the United States, and tend at least to check the movement of everybody, all the young people, toward the city? Don't you think we ought to stop that?

Mr. TITUS. Certainly that is my desire.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if there is any movement that tends—that even tends—toward checking the avalanche of people from the farms to the cities, and these boys that have come back, who have been on the farms and don't want to go out on them—if we can in some way counteract that, isn't that a beneficial public service, and can't we afford to spend some money even upon that proposition?

Mr. TITUS. Yes; I favor the expenditure of some money.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why don't you come in and help us work this out?

Mr. TITUS. Well, I will submit something to you. I will get a few of my Nassau County friends together—and we have some big men there—and submit something to you.

Mr. TAYLOR. How long are you going to wait?

Mr. TITUS. Within a few days.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a matter of fact, why didn't you bring this along with you?

Mr. TITUS. Well, I have been here in Washington—I was here twice last week on this appropriation bill, and I tell you while I haven't any business at all, I am the busiest man in the world, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Titus, just one question. I notice your association, the Nassau County Farm Bureau Association, you are co-operators with the New York State Department of Agriculture?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, in this bulletin I have referred to, No. 78 of the department of agriculture of the State of New York, is this statement, on page 429:

The State needs more and better farmers, and it is that class that this department particularly appeals to and to which the State will give a warm welcome. The Census figures show that only 375,000 people are actively engaged in agriculture in this State. There is ample room for more than double that number.

You agree with that statement?

Mr. TITUS. I should say that that was practically correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any more questions, gentlemen?

Mr. NICHOLS. I would like to ask one question.

You heard the reference made by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Taylor, to the desire of all the people to help and aid the soldiers?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. And you heard also the reference to the impatience of the soldiers themselves?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. And that some sort of measure should be enacted in their aid?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you believe that all the soldiers, or the great majority of the soldiers, are impatient that a small percentage of the soldiers shall be aided to go on the farm?

Mr. TITUS. In my locality a very small proportion of the soldiers are in favor of it. They are contented to loaf, and I will venture to say that that is the condition that prevails in many other localities.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, this bill from the standpoint of reclaiming lands may be all right; I think it is; but do you believe that Congress should enact legislation that would take care of a reasonable percentage of all the soldiers?

Mr. TITUS. I am inclined to think so.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you not think, Mr. Titus, that 95 per cent, or at least 90 per cent, of the returning soldiers have their own business arrangements and occupation to which they will turn, and that they will not need any particular encouragement from the Government? This legislation is framed to take care of the others who may want to go into agricultural pursuits and have no means to enter that occupation.

Mr. TITUS. I would naturally think that would be the case, but from information I have received in different ways through the press I am led to believe that a very small percentage of them wish to go back to the occupations that they left to go into the service.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Well, in all probability most of them have their plans arranged to go into other activities that are probably more remunerative.

Mr. TITUS. Probably they would not want to go back to their former occupations.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Titus, the chairman called your attention to some literature that says that the State of New York, I believe it

was New York—that in that State there were three hundred and some odd thousand farmers—375,000 farmers?

The CHAIRMAN. No; people engaged in agriculture. There are 215,597 farms in New York.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, do you know how many soldiers this bill would place on the farm for the amount of money that is authorized to be appropriated?

Mr. TITUS. No.

Mr. NICHOLS. You don't know that the amount of money authorized to be appropriated by this bill would probably not take care of any more than 100,000?

Mr. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I have great faith in the deliberations of this body of men, and I know that good results will come from it to aid our returning soldiers, and if my services, in a humble way, humble as they are, can be of any service to you, I am only too glad to help you.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been very helpful.

Gentlemen, Mr. McCracken, former Member of Congress from Idaho, wants to say just a word.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT M. MCCRACKEN, OF IDAHO.

Mr. MCCRACKEN. I want to say, gentlemen, that in a general way, the people of my State indorse this bill. I want to say further that a large number of the people, whom I represent, are returning soldiers. We sent, out of a population of 400,000 people, 20,000 men to the front—at least most of those men went to the front. Now, that is a big percentage, and I want to say, too, gentlemen, that out of that number the larger percentage of them were farmers, and I think I am safe in saying that the larger number of the men who went from all the States west of the Mississippi River were boys that were drawn from the homes of farmers. That might also apply to the men who came from the South, the larger percentage.

Now, it is simply idle so say that these men, many of them, will not be attracted by any proposition which this Government may make with reference to putting men upon farms. They would be attracted by it, gentlemen, and since the matter has been pressed, and since it has been sponsored by the Secretary of the Interior, there isn't any doubt, too, but what they are expecting something of the sort. Now, of course, you gentlemen who come from the industrial sections of the country will say: "Well, we have fellows that probably will want to be helped to get a home in the city." That may all be true, and I hope that some means will be devised which will permit that sort of thing. But, gentlemen, after all, this great number of men who were drafted and who went to the front, a large percentage of whom are farmers, are looking to the Congress of the United States to give them some sort of assistance, and, of course, the natural thing which would attract them, as I said before, would be some inducement to go back to the soil. So that I don't want to feel that this committee is taking a wrong course.

It seems to me that this committee has chosen a very wise course in trying to devise some sort of legislation which will give these men an opportunity to at least choose the occupation of a farmer, because,

gentlemen, after all, the occupation of the farmer to-day is not what it was 40 or 50 years ago. He has a great many facilities which permit him to enjoy the comforts of the city in a rural community. He has the automobile and he has the telephone. It is a common thing to-day in the West for people to establish town sites, to have their community schools, their community centers, and then go out into the different sections of the country and till their farms. They will go back for 15 or 20 miles. That is farming to-day in the West, and it is farming in a large portion of the South.

These gentlemen who come here from these agricultural associations in New York, I want just to remind them that the reason they have so much agricultural country in the State of New York that is not fitted for agriculture has been demonstrated, because the young men of New York State have left there and have gone to those sections where there is country that does afford them an opportunity for agriculture. Now, isn't that the most natural thing that they should do? And certainly this Government is not going to select these barren wastes in the East, nor in any other section of the country, which would not afford them the opportunity to go ahead and engage in agricultural pursuits.

MR. NICHOLS. You think this bill would take them West? Is that it?

MR. MCCracken. I think it would take them to the agricultural localities of all sections of the United States which would be attractive, and, of course, those sections would be selected by the Secretary of the Interior, with the aid of the Agricultural Department, don't you see. The Government of the United States is not going to send them out into localities where they can't exist. That is not the object of this bill.

And now here, coming back to this question, I simply want to make this plain to you gentlemen—I think you will all agree with me, you gentlemen upon this committee—that in all opposition that has been voiced here to this bill there has not been a specific allegation to show wherein the bill would not be operative. I wish these gentlemen would specify wherein the bill would not be practicable or operative. I have an open mind and I am willing to aid in the small way that I can to assist the committee and assist Members of Congress to find some way which is a better way than the way that is prescribed in this bill.

As to the question of competition, which we hear urged in the agricultural press, that it might make competition—and the gentleman from New York a moment ago hinted at that, that certain competition might arise by reason of this increased area of agriculture—I just want to say, gentlemen, that that is mere folly, because in all those Western States you will see different articles of merchandise bearing the brands of New York firms. How often we see Beechnut butter and Beechnut meat and Beechnut beans, and all that sort of thing out in the West, in practically every Western State. Those people moved out there, many of them from the East, and they are consuming the products of these people back in New York State, and I venture the assertion that we have firms in the State of Idaho to-day that are purchasing in the aggregate as much as \$20,000,000 worth of merchandise of various kinds, including, I might add to

that, farm machinery. I am informed that we stand fifth in the purchase of automobiles, and a good many of them are Studebakers that come from the State of Indiana. In my judgment the passage of this bill will encourage not only farming, but it will encourage other industries.

You very well know the number of Ford automobiles that we have in the West, and all these come from the State of Michigan; and that is simply one illustration. There are thousands of manufactured articles which come to our people in the West, so that if you attempt in this small way to aid the returning soldiers, you have aided the industrial sections of the whole United States. I hope no one will think that you are striving in any way to augment the business conditions of any particular section of the country, because all sections of the United States will naturally enjoy the fruits of this legislation.

I don't know what more I could say, other than simply to call attention also to the fact that the gentlemen who have preceded me have come down here to appeal for further appropriations for county farm agents. Now, why? Simply because they realize the value of agriculture in their own community, and those New York gentlemen expect to get increased appropriations for county farm agents. Of course we have county farm agents all over the United States, and why? Simply because they know that the country must rely upon the industry of agriculture for the larger part of its prosperity.

If there are any questions that I can answer, I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. NICHOLS. You say you represent the returned soldiers of your State?

Mr. McCracken. I represent what is known as the Idaho Reclamation Association, in which there are a large number of returned soldiers.

Mr. NICHOLS. You said you thought you expressed the view of the great majority of the soldiers of your State who were returning from the war?

Mr. McCracken. I believe I do.

Mr. NICHOLS. What makes you think you do?

Mr. McCracken. For the reason that many of them are agriculturists and are looking forward to this kind of legislation. They expect it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, have you come in contact with them to explain this bill to them?

Mr. McCracken. I will say this, Mr. Nichols, that I have met a good many of them in camps. I was a soldier myself for a short period of time, and I have met them as they came back. I am a member, of course, of their own local association in my home city, and I know it is the thought of many of them how they might get a small tract of land and be independent. - That is the feeling of many of the fellows I have talked to.

Mr. NICHOLS. How many do you suppose you have come in contact with?

Mr. McCracken. I have not talked to a great number, but I have talked to enough of them to convince me that they express the sentiment of the great majority.

Mr. NICHOLS. How many, can you estimate?

Mr. McCracken. Oh, probably 35 or 40. They come into my office and talk to me.

Mr. Nichols. Did you explain the details and provisions of the Mondell bill?

Mr. McCracken. Certainly not; simply because the bill had not been introduced until the 19th day of May, and the public was not advised of its provisions.

Mr. Nichols. How many soldiers did you say went to war from your State?

Mr. McCracken. About 20,000.

Mr. Nichols. And you think the majority of these soldiers were farmers?

Mr. McCracken. The great majority of them were farmers; yes, sir.

Mr. Nichols. And they desire to return to the farm?

Mr. McCracken. Unquestionably they have that in view; they will doubtless come back to the farm.

Mr. Nichols. And they desire to be aided by the Government?

Mr. McCracken. Well, they would desire to avail themselves of any action of the Government, and naturally they are best fitted for the particular occupation of farming.

Mr. Nichols. How many would you say of the 20,000, most of whom are farmers, would want to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded in this measure?

Mr. McCracken. Well, I think your question is hardly pertinent—you assume that I possess accurate information. I don't want you to assume that; neither do I presume to speak accurately, but I am simply speaking in a general way from the conversations which I have had with these gentlemen.

Mr. Nichols. Could you estimate?

Mr. McCracken. Yes; I think I could estimate it. I think I would be safe in saying that 80 per cent of them would be glad to avail themselves of any offer the Government might make along agricultural lines.

Mr. Taylor. To acquire a home for themselves?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. Nichols. Do you think that under the provisions of this bill and the amount of money that is authorized to be appropriated, that any such percentage could be provided for under this measure, under this bill, from the soldiers of your State?

Mr. McCracken. Why, certainly.

Mr. Nichols. You think they could under this bill? How many soldiers do you think that this bill will take care of?

Mr. McCracken. How many do I think this bill will take care of?

Mr. Nichols. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. I want to say this, that it will doubtless take care of the larger number of the men, of the returning soldiers, who desire to pursue agricultural activities throughout the whole country. There isn't any question about it, and just as was intimated here a while ago by Mr. Smith, the Representative from Idaho, pointing out the fact that there is a large number of men who will want to engage in agricultural pursuits, the point is to provide for and take care of that number; don't let them drift back in the city and be-

come helpless there, because they are not trained along vocational lines.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know that under the authorization, the appropriation authorized under this bill, probably no more than 100,000 in the whole country could be taken care of?

Mr. McCracken. I think that the gentleman is mistaken as to the number.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, we will see whether he is or not, Mr. McCracken. Do you know how much appropriation this bill authorizes?

Mr. McCracken. It doesn't authorize enough; I will say that.

Mr. NICHOLS. How much does it authorize?

Mr. McCracken. It authorizes \$500,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, is it the plan to try to close at 12?

The CHAIRMAN. We should like to.

Mr. FERRIS. Might I make a suggestion, then? I just met here a Mr. Lehmann, a soldier that I have never seen before, a nice young man who has just returned from France and bears all the evidence of the hardships of war, and I have suggested to him and asked him that if he would like to say a word to the committee on this bill, we would like to have him, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Lehmann be given a few moments—be given the honor of closing the hearings, of having the last word to say on this subject. It seems to me that would be entirely appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear Mr. Lehmann.

Mr. FERRIS. If Mr. McCracken is through—I did not intend to interrupt you, Mr. Nichols.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; I will be glad to hear him.

Mr. FERRIS. I will say that Mr. Lehmann explains that he is not a speaker at all; he doesn't care to exhibit any oratorical qualities, but he simply wants to say a word from the real standpoint of the soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Lehmann.

STATEMENT OF PVT. EMILE A. LEHMANN, COMPANY D, THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. LEHMANN. Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Ferris says, I haven't much to say, but I have met together with quite a few boys that were interested in this bill, as far as we have had it explained to us in France. We have had a man explain it to use as best he could, the details of the bill, and we have seen a few prints in the papers on it. That is about as far as I know the details of the bill, but I myself am interested in getting a western farm home, and a lot of the soldiers are who have been with me—they are also interested, and I have been over quite a large area of western land that undoubtedly would be put under some of the projects if this bill passes. I have seen the good qualities of this land and I know what can be produced from it, and it is very valuable for agricultural purposes.

Mr. VAILE. What part of the country are you from?

Mr. LEHMANN. I come from Montana. That is where I entered the service from. My folks are in West Virginia.

Mr. WHITE. What part of Montana, what county?

Mr. LEHMANN. I have been around Billings, and I have been around Great Falls and in the northwestern part, and Kalispell, and I have seen quite a bit of the State.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you believe that there is a great deal of land in Montana, and what is known as "bench" land that could be very profitably segregated for a scheme of this kind, a reclamation scheme, without great expense to the Government, and which would promise splendid opportunities to the young men?

Mr. LEHMANN. There is, yes sir; but the area of that kind of land is not very large. It would not give the opportunity for a large project like there is in Wyoming.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you believe that such projects could be found in Montana? Don't you think there are within the State some projects?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, not as good a project as I understand this Idaho project would be.

Mr. MAYS. You say your people live in West Virginia?

Mr. LEHMANN. West Virginia; yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Do you feel that you ought to be assisted to secure a home in the immediate neighborhood of your people?

Mr. LEHMANN. No.

Mr. MAYS. Why not?

Mr. LEHMANN. Because the land in the immediate neighborhood where my folks live is not of very good agricultural quality.

Mr. MAYS. And is higher in price than other land?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes.

Mr. BENHAM. Who would you have do the deciding for you, yourself or some Government agent, as to where you want to settle?

Mr. LEHMANN. I would want to decide that myself.

Mr. MAYS. You don't understand that this bill dictates to you anything about where you should go, do you?

Mr. LEHMANN. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH, of Idaho. You can go in any State where there is a project.

Mr. TAYLOR. You boys are not so much concerned about the details, the working out of the thing? What you want to see—what you approve is, and what a lot of the boys approve is, that they would like to be home owners somewhere?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if the Government could help help them in some manner, you feel that they would be glad to take advantage of it?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. And as to the locality or as to the working out of the machinery, the details of that is not what you are concerned about?

Mr. LEHMANN. No, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Have you talked to a great many soldiers in France on this subject?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And you noticed considerable interest among the soldiers?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Let me ask you this question: Is or is it not true that a lot of soldiers might not want to go out on farms to work as farm hands, but they would go out to work if they had the Government

promise of giving them a home and letting them own a piece of land at the end of their work?

Mr. LEHMANN. Why, that is just it. There is a lot of the soldiers, a lot of the boys, who would be very willing to go onto a farm and go through considerable hardship if they see a chance where they could get a home.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are perfectly willing to do a lot of hard work if they had the Government's promise that at the end of it they would get a home that they could own themselves?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Have you worked on a farm?

Mr. LEHMANN. I have worked on a farm in different places in the northwest. I was born and raised on a farm in West Virginia.

Mr. WHITE. For how long a period did you work on a farm?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, at different times.

Mr. WHITE. Altogether, how many years?

Mr. LEHMANN. I might say all my life.

Mr. WHITE. Now, that is very good. Don't you think that your experience on a farm would be a great advantage to you in engaging in farming?

Mr. LEHMANN. Oh, yes; it would.

Mr. WHITE. Indeed, I think so.

Mr. LEHMANN. That is one reason why I went over several States—worked over several States—I wanted to get the different ideas, and I got a lot of good ideas from different localities. Of course, in one locality the same idea might not work in another locality.

Mr. WHITE. And speaking for yourself, if you felt confident that you could succeed finally and make a home, you would be willing to undergo a great deal of hardship and hard toil, would you not?

Mr. LEHMANN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. And with the fixed purpose to succeed and to finally make a home? That is the idea with you, is it?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Lehmann, of course, while you are not concerned with the machinery that will put this plan into operation, you are concerned in how much one of these farms will cost you?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, that, of course, depends a whole lot on the different localities where they are located.

Mr. NICHOLS. I say, but you are concerned in how much it will cost you?

Mr. LEHMANN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. NICHOLS. You care how much it will cost you?

Mr. LEHMANN. To some extent; yes sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. You want to know how much you are going to pay for this farm that you are going on?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, anybody naturally would want to know how much he would have to pay for it, but that part of it is easy enough arranged so that a man could see that. And as long as the boys got a good square deal, I don't doubt in the least that a large number of them will be willing to go on a farm.

Mr. NICHOLS. How much do you think this would cost you?

Mr. LEHMANN. I haven't figured that out.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know?

Mr. LEHMANN. I haven't gone into any details about that.

Mr. NICHOLS. You haven't read this bill, have you?

Mr. LEHMANN. Not the latest bill out; no.

Mr. NICHOLS. You don't know how much it would cost you?

Mr. LEHMANN. No.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know that you would have to have \$1,200, approximately, before you could go on one of these farms?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, that seems reasonable enough to have—to have that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know how many soldiers that you have met, and have talked this bill over with, are in favor of the proposition as it is understood now, as you understand it?

Mr. LEHMANN. No; how many I couldn't say, but a large per cent of them, I should say, among the organizations that I met.

Mr. VAILE. You are not so much concerned, Mr. Lehmann, are you, with the question of whether it is going to cost you \$1,200 or \$10,000, as with the question of whether you will get value for your money?

Mr. LEHMANN. That is the point; yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. You also understand, Mr. Lehmann, that you have a chance to work and earn wages to pay for it?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Lehmann, you think that the Government should extend aid to the soldiers who are returning from the war to go on the farms; do you think that the Government should extend aid to the thousands and hundreds of thousands and maybe millions of soldiers who are from city homes, who have lived all their lives in the city? Do you think they should extend some kind of aid to them?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes; they should.

Mr. NICHOLS. You don't believe it should be restricted entirely to the soldier who wants to go on a farm?

Mr. LEHMANN. Well, it seems that they all should have a chance, probably, but if there is a good chance for them on farm lands, which would improve the country, it seems that that would be a good thing to put through.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know how many soldiers this plan would take care of?

Mr. LEHMANN. No; the number I don't know.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you just happen to come up here to-day?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Were you invited up?

Mr. LEHMANN. Yes; I was taken in on the way here.

Mr. NICHOLS. By whom?

Mr. LEHMANN. By Mr. Harris. But it was my intention to come up here, and I just happened to meet him, and he showed me up. I wanted to get some information, to get some of the papers and the bill.

Mr. VAILE. You were not invited in here until after you came up here to get information?

Mr. LEHMANN. I met some men at the K. C. last night that told me about it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Harris?

Mr. LEHMANN. Mr. Harris?

Mr. NICHOLS. Who is Mr. Harris?

Mr. LEHMANN. One of these gentlemen here, perhaps, knows him better than I do. I haven't met him before last night.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you were not invited to address the committee until you happened to be talking with Mr. Ferris here in the room?

Mr. LEHMANN. I was not invited until I was here in the room; not until after Mr. Harris left. I had no intention of addressing the committee at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope a real sun-burned soldier and a real man who has seen service will not have to apologize for coming here, but if he does, I want to take all the blame for having him speak here. I sat behind him there not five minutes ago, the first time I ever saw him in my life, and I asked him to appear and say something, and I want to add that I think it is exceedingly appropriate that one of these 4,000,000 boys that has returned, with the real harness marks of war on him, should have an opportunity to make a statement, and I want to add further that I think he has made a very creditable statement, and as one member of the committee, I want to say that I am very glad that he has made this statement, and I assume that must be the view of the committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree with you fully.

Mr. WHITE. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think this young soldier has been one of the best witnesses that has become before this committee.

Mr. FERRIS. I think so, too. He is a real fellow, with real stripes on him.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think we all feel that way.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the soldier one more question.

Don't you think that whatever might be the plan adopted finally by Congress after this committee has reported—and assuming that a plan is adopted, as we all think there should be—don't you think that the element of success would largely be the disposition of the individual to succeed? That he would have to have a fixed purpose; that he would have to have that in his mind and thought? In other words, if he was thinking this thing over, as you have been, looking for a location, that would be one of the important, paramount elements of success in his case? Don't you think it would?

Mr. LEHMANN. It surely would.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you think one thing further, that a young man like yourself, or any one of your comrades, if he had had that in his mind and was willing, as you say you are, to undergo hardships through a long period in order to build up a home, that that would be a safer proposition for the Government, for the solvency of the investment, the Government's investment; that the Government, in other words, would be less likely to lose in that case? Do you agree with that?

Mr. LEHMANN. I don't quite understand you.

Mr. WHITE. I say, the young man who had, as you say you have, a fixed purpose to succeeded wherever he might locate; that was familiar with the circumstances and had the purpose to make a home, don't you believe that he would be a safer bet for the Government, that the Government would be safer in loaning him money than it

would a man who took it up on an impulse or experiment without the technical knowledge that you have?

Mr. LEHMANN. That certainly would be the case.

Mr. WHITE. That is my question.

Mr. LEHMANN. That stands to reason. That is very plain.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Lehmann.

Gentlemen, the committee, I suppose, will stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, would you allow Mr. McCracken to be recalled for just one or two short questions?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. McCracken, I am not familiar with the agriculture of your State. I would like to ask you this question: Are there segregated tracts of agricultural land in your State for sale? I mean here and there, as there are in most States, that are well adapted to successful cultivation? I mean on your bench lands. I mean now, to make my question perfectly plain, a tract of 80 acres or 100 acres? There is land changing hands, is there, possibly?

Mr. McCracken. Now in private ownership?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I wanted to know. Now, Mr. McCracken, those lands are good agricultural lands, are they not, upon your bench lands, much as they are in Montana?

Mr. McCracken. We think they are better than they are in Montana.

Mr. WHITE. Well, if they are as good as they are in Montana, they are about the best in the world. Those lands are changing hands constantly?

Mr. McCracken. They have been.

Mr. WHITE. Now, Mr. McCracken, I want to ask you this question. In a case where a soldier, a returned soldier, comes back to his home and wants to resume agriculture, if his father is not able to stake him, but he has the ambition to go ahead and succeed, as men must have, don't you think one of those tracts would be a good investment if he was able to finance it, or if the Government would assist him in financing it?

Mr. McCracken. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WHITE. You would not object to a thing of that kind, would you?

Mr. McCracken. Certainly not.

Mr. WHITE. Do you not think, Mr. McCracken, that in a case such as I have suggested, that the young man with all this experience of life would stand a very good chance to succeed?

Mr. McCracken. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Well, don't you believe that in case the Government would finance him, that it would be a pretty safe bet for the Government?

Mr. McCracken. It would.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. McCracken. I want to thank the committee for hearing me.

The CHAIRMAN. And we thank you very much.

Mr. McCracken. I also want to thank Mr. Nichols for his interrogations.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned until Tuesday morning.

(Whereupon, at 12.30 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned until Tuesday morning, June 24, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Tuesday, June 24, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock, Hon. N. J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. This meeting was called for the purpose of hearing from Mr. Hallam. He was invited to appear pursuant to the order made at the last meeting of the committee, on motion of Mr. Nichols.

STATEMENT OF F. C. HALLAM, PRESS REPRESENTATIVE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Hallam, it was at my request that the invitation was extended to you to appear to-day.

Mr. HALLAM. So I understand.

Mr. NICHOLS. And because of certain things that were perhaps unintentionally insinuated in the remarks that were made regarding my invitation to you, I want to say to you that I have no criticism of any kind of you and, even though you may say that you have represented somebody in the capacity of publicity agent, so far as I am concerned you have a perfectly legitimate right to appear.

Mr. HALLAM. Thank you, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. And I want it understood that there is no criticism of you implied in the questions I ask, regardless of what anybody else may say.

Mr. HALLAM. Thank you, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Hallam, if you were the author of some literature that was sent to the Press Club for the purpose of general distribution throughout the country in favor of the Mondell bill, which this committee is considering?

Mr. HALLAM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it not be well to incorporate in the record the press notice of June 19?

Mr. NICHOLS. I think so; yes. I will show this to you and ask if that is the article referred to?

Mr. HALLAM. Yes; I wrote that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I will ask that that be placed in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the article will be incorporated in the record.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

Pointing out that there are large areas of very fertile land along the Mississippi River that is subject to occasional overflow and areas of fertile cut-over lands in the Lake States as well as the South that can be reclaimed to make

farms for soldiers, Representative Mondell, of Wyoming, Republican leader of the House of Representatives, to-day closed the testimony in favor of his bill for soldiers' settlements at a hearing before the House Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. Mondell answered arguments that have been made against certain provisions of the bill. He asserted that it would enable all soldiers who want farms to obtain them. Taking up the objection that the bill is a reclamation measure, Mr. Mondell admitted that that is one of its purposes.

"The winning of America from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate has been one continuous work of reclamation," said Mr. Mondell. He denounced as impractical suggestions that the Government finance soldiers in taking isolated farms. Such plans have been unsuccessful in Australia and other countries. On the other hand, the colonization plan as proposed in his bill, under which soldiers will be located in communities on the land, has been proven successful.

The Republican leader answered a number of questions asked by members of the committee. Every advocate of land-settlement plans different from those contemplated in his bill, he said, has admitted the dangers and difficulties they involve. Denying that farmers oppose the community soldier-settlement plan, Mr. Mondell said that there has been some little opposition voiced by "agriculturists," whom he described as a class that "farms the farmers."

Next week the House Public Lands Committee is expected to take up the Mondell bill for consideration and an early and favorable report on it is looked for, possibly with minor amendments. A very large majority of the committee will vote for the report, after which there may be a meeting of the Republican steering committee of the House, of which Representative Mondell is chairman, to see what can be done to assist the bill in the House.

Meanwhile Secretary of the Interior Lane has reported favorably to the Senate Committee on Public Lands upon Senator Smoot's bill for soldiers' land settlement. This measure is like the Mondell bill except that it contains a provision that 10 per cent of the wages of a soldier employed in constructing the project shall be withheld to form a fund from which he is to discharge part of his obligation to the Government for the purchase, improvement, and equipment of a farm. Senator Smoot advocates this change as a measure to encourage thrift among the soldier workers. In order to still further assist them his bill provides that the Government shall pay 4 per cent interest to the soldier on that part of his wages so withheld.

Senator Smoot does not propose immediate hearings on the soldiers' land bill before his committee. Later on it is understood that H. T. Cory, consulting engineer in charge of the southern district, United States Reclamation Service, will appear before the Senate committee and tell about the possibilities offered in the South and elsewhere under the bill.

In his report on the Smoot bill, Secretary Lane tells of the great interest manifested by southern States and other States in the soldier-settlement project and the preliminary steps they have taken in connection with it, in the matter of adopting memorials indorsing the plan, authorizing cooperation with the Federal Government, appointing commissions to study the land situation and to assist and advise the Government, and otherwise. The Secretary also says that soldiers', commercial, and other organizations have passed resolutions favoring the plan.

"I believe this measure is one of the most important pieces of constructive legislation before Congress and earnestly recommend its early enactment," says Secretary Lane in his report. "The scope of the bill is clearly indicated by its title and its enactment will help the soldier—

"By providing him with employment upon his separation from the military service, affording him an opportunity to acquire and save funds necessary for the payment of the first installment upon his farm.

"By providing him with a chance to secure and improve a farm home.

"Making available the money and credit needed to improve and equip his farm.

"Reducing the cost of farm buildings and other permanent improvements through the purchase of material in wholesale quantities for cash.

"Giving the soldier an opportunity to get practical advice regarding farming operations.

"Permitting of the organizing of community settlements for more effective buying and selling by the settlers.

"Making farming more profitable and attractive by cooperative organizations and the resulting closed social and business relations."

Mr. NICHOLS. Have you any objection to informing this committee if you were employed to do this or whether you did it on your account.

Mr. HALLAM. No; I have no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Were you employed to do it or did you do it on your account?

Mr. HALLAM. I was employed some time ago to do some publicity work in connection with this bill and some other matters.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, have you any objection to saying who employed you?

Mr. HALLAM. No, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will you state who employed you?

Mr. HALLAM. The Southern Settlement & Development Organization.

Mr. NICHOLS. What is the Southern Settlement & Development Organization?

Mr. HALLAM. Why it is chartered under the laws of Maryland.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it a private corporation?

Mr. HALLAM. I do not know.

Mr. NICHOLS. They are interested in having this bill enacted into law?

Mr. HALLAM. The organization dates back some years, and it was formed, as I understand it, to promote development and improvement work of various kinds in the South.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it a private corporation?

Mr. HALLAM. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know if this association is composed of men in the South who have large property interests and who might be interested to the extent of selling this land to the Government, if we put this bill through?

Mr. HALLAM. I understand that the organization is made up of a number of representative citizens—bankers, business men, educators, State officials, some railroad men, and various others. I am also informed that its charter distinctly forbids the association selling any land.

Mr. NICHOLS. Its charter may forbid it, that is, as a corporation; but do you know whether or not the membership of this organization is made up of large land owners in that part of the country? You would not say that it is not made up of men who have land they could sell under this bill.

Mr. HALLAM. I don't know; I think it may include men of that class in its membership; but not solely of those men.

Mr. NICHOLS. Not solely; I do not say that, but a great many men who would?

Mr. HALLAM. I could not say how many.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is all I care to ask you, Mr. Hallam; I am very much obliged to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee care to ask any questions of Mr. Hallam? Then, I guess that is all, Mr. Hallam.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have another matter I wish to call to the attention of this committee. I think it is of great interest to the committee. I want to call the attention of the committee to the testimony of the young soldier who made his appear-

ance in this committee room Saturday morning, and who was invited to speak by Mr. Ferris, a member of the committee. I want to make the statement to the committee that this young man who apparently was a very fine young farmer soldier, was unconsciously being made use of by a man representing private land interests in the West, men who have private interest and private gains at stake in the enactment of this bill.

I asked Mr. Lehmann, as I recollect his name to be, who caused him to come here. There seemed to be some little indignation on the part of some of the members that I questioned this soldier. Mr. Lehmann gave the name of Mr. Harris. Of course, I am new in these land reclamation matters, and I did not know Mr. Harris. Nobody before this committee seemed to place Mr. Harris. I now want to state to the committee that the Mr. Harris who talked with this young soldier and caused this young soldier to make his appearance before this committee, as he said in answer to my question, comes from Harding, Mont., and is the representative of the Big Horn Investment Co.

Now, undoubtedly, a good many of you members here who come from the West know more of the Big Horn Investment Co. than I do. I am not familiar with those things. I may know more about it after a while. But this man who prompted this soldier, who made his lonely appearance before this committee because he was the only private soldier to come before this committee—he was caused to come here, undoubtedly without him realizing he was being made use of by the talk of Mr. Harris, and Mr. Harris represents the Big Horn Investment Co.

After making that statement to this committee, I desire to make a motion that Mr. Harris, whose address I will very gladly find and give to the clerk of this committee, or the chairman of this committee if he desires it, be requested to come before this committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Pending that motion, I want to make a statement. Mr. Chairman, I invited that red-haired, sun-burned, faded-out soldier to address this committee, myself. I never saw that soldier before that day, and I have not seen him since.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. FERRIS. I never saw Mr. Harris to know him. If he has ever been here before I do not know it. I never knew that there was such a person on earth. I never heard of the Big Horn Investment Co., and I did not know that there was such an investment company on earth. I merely saw that private soldier sitting there. The hearings had been dragging on; we had had people of every conceivable kind before this committee, presenting their views to us, and I thought it was high time and proper that a real soldier who had the battle marks on him should give us his views. And I went over and sat down by him and invited him on my own initiative to get up and say a word. He replied to me that he was on here and he merely came in to see what he could learn about relief for the soldiers; that he had never made a speech in his life and did not know how to talk, and had not come here with the intention of making any statements. I stepped around and spoke to the chairman and told him what I had done, and he told me he was here and it was all right for me to have extended him the invitation, and the chairman very graciously said he could make a statement and he was asked to do so.

I feel that statement is necessary in answer to your statement, Mr. Nichols, because I fear your statement might be mistaken.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am glad you made your explanation.

Mr. FERRIS. If anybody had any idea of having the soldier appear, I never knew of it, and if any Mr. Harris invited that soldier to come here and see if he could learn anything about the bill, he never mentioned it to me, and I would say also that that soldier very reluctantly consented to appear and evidently did not come here to be heard. He said, "I can not speak," and I said, "Well, you are well posted on this matter, and get up and say what you know."

Mr. NICHOLS. I suggest he was a good-looking soldier, and well picked by the man who picked him, and I want to say to the committee that I accept your statement, and did not intend to convey any suggestion that you knew anything about it.

Mr. FERRIS. I am afraid your statement left that impression.

Mr. ELSTON. I have heard iterated and reiterated the statement that we have heard from only one private soldier. We have had reference made by Secretary Lane here to others—to replies made by 80,000 soldiers made on this proposition, and we could read here for 10 months and consume two hours a day reading from laudatory letters—from first-hand testimony now, from letters covering every phase of this proposition. So it is all balderdash to say we have not heard from private soldiers. We have heard more from private soldiers than from anybody else, and we have spent more time up one side and down the other on the views of private soldiers than from anybody else. And what is the use of getting what is merely the opinion of one or two men, when we have 80,000?

Mr. NICHOLS. That is not my purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. What is our purpose of pursuing a private line of this kind, as to how that soldier came here to give his testimony? Of course, it might be that he came here because of some suggestion of somebody else, but if we are going off on sidetracks——

Mr. NICHOLS. We are going——

Mr. ELSTON. To thrash out issues of some sinister conspiracy on the part of some big private company to use a stocking horse to some in here and knock this thing, when that is the only testimony I know of, of all the testimony that is in and it can not weigh in the consideration of the testimony as a whole. It looks to me as if it would be absolutely a waste of the time of this committee to go off on side lines of that sort and to exploit this little sinister campaign that evidently somebody was put up to do something. Now, if you are going on to do that (and that is not saying this man did not get some suggestion to come in here) I think it is high time we should close these hearings.

Mr. BENHAM. The remark has very often been indulged in in this committee of the fact that there was a corrupt propoganda against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I have never heard the term "corrupt" used here.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Benham, that term has not been used once that I have heard of.

Mr. BENHAM. You have not always been here, to begin with.

Mr. ELSTON. What do you mean?

Mr. BENHAM. It has been referred to as the propaganda, and the inference, at least, on many occasions, was that it was improper.

Mr. MAYS. The record will show it?

Mr. BENHAM. The record will show it.

Mr. MAYS. Who used it?

Mr. BENHAM. I do not recall. Possibly not in the language I have given, but it was mentioned time after time that somebody was interested in discrediting this bill for financial reasons and all that sort of thing. Now, there are a good many things that some of us would care to have put in the record on the other side that might possibly be illuminating as to why this particular bill, in this particular shape, is being worked for so assiduously. I think Mr. Nichols's motion ought to prevail, and if it is voted down it will not have a good effect.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Benham, is Mr. Nichols's idea this——

Mr. NICHOLS. Suppose I tell you what my idea is.

Mr. ELSTON. I was asking Mr. Benham.

Mr. NICHOLS. You can not ask him what my idea is.

Mr. ELSTON. I heard part of his statement, and I will state it and you can correct me; Mr. Nichols's idea seems to be this, that you have heard from nobody except one private soldier, and because of the fact we have heard from one private soldier, that he was a stalking-horse and came in here unconsciously?

Mr. FERRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I deny that he was sent here for that purpose, although I know nothing about the facts, because I induced him to speak myself.

Mr. BENHAM. How do you know he was not sent here by some one else?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know if he was sent here by some one else, but I know I induced him to speak myself, and if there is any blame to attach to that, put the blame on me. But I know that soldier did not want to talk. I saw him sitting over here, and I went over and sat down by him, and I said, "Who are you?" and he said, "My name is Lehmann," and I said, "Where are you from?" and he said, "I just came back from France." I said, "What are you doing here?" He said he just wanted to find out something about this bill. I said how did you know you were going to find out anything about this bill here. He said through the Y. M. C. A. I said, "Would you like to say something?" He said, "I am no speaker; I can not speak," and I invited him to get up and tell us what he thought about it, and I turned to the chairman and told him what I had done, and the chairman said it was very proper.

Now, Mr. Nichols, I think you draw a wrong inference, and you do the soldier an injustice, and you do yourself an injustice, because I induced that soldier to talk myself.

Mr. NICHOLS. You did not induce him to come here?

Mr. FERRIS. No; but I induced that soldier to talk, and if it had not been for me he would not have said a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The situation is just this: This soldier came before the committee on the invitation of Mr. Ferris; that is, he was invited out of the audience. He told the committee frankly he was seeking information about this bill, about this legislation, and that some Mr. Harris told him he could come up here and get it. Now, the situa-

tion is as Mr. Ferris has just narrated. I never saw that soldier myself; I never heard of him until Mr. Ferris called my attention to him. I never heard of Mr. Harris.

Mr. FERRIS. Would that soldier have made any response or had a right to make a statement here of any sort but for my activity?

The CHAIRMAN. He would not. You called him to my attention; you, and you alone. I can not think that soldier was sent here in connection with any propaganda.

Mr. NICHOLS. How do you know?

The CHAIRMAN. I know from Mr. Ferris's statement.

Mr. NICHOLS. He did not tell you that he would not have gotten up unless Mr. Ferris asked him?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Ferris has so clearly presented the matter that there can not be any doubt, not the slightest doubt on earth, as to his statement and the reasons he asked him. And I know I have noticed a couple here who did not speak (they were not asked to speak), and I was a little sorry I had not asked them after they had left. Mr. Nichols, though, has raised a question that does not involve Mr. Ferris.

Mr. NICHOLS. Absolutely not.

Mr. RAKER. And there is a Mr. Harris in town who appeared before the Water Power Committee last year and he has been here, I think we could clear up the matter and avoid any taint in the record on Mr. Nichol's proposition at all if Mr. Harris came for five minutes and told us what he knew about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Raker, personally I do not see where there is anything to clear up.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not see any taint in this record here.

Mr. FERRIS. The whole proposition is simply this: I sat here and the hearings were dragging along, and we had had every conceivable view presented before this committee, and I sat over here and glanced with unrest and saw that poor faded-out, sunburned soldier sitting over there. I went over and sat down beside him and asked him who he was, where he came from, and if he did not want to say a word. And I had no idea where he hailed from; I knew I had never seen him before, and I have not seen him since he walked out of this room. I never saw him before I saw him in this room, and I had never spoken to him before I spoke to him in this room, and he had no idea of speaking before I did that. And I feel if there is any injustice or any calumny in inviting a soldier who is sitting in the audience to say a few words to this committee that the blame ought to be on me.

Mr. WHITE. There has not been any insinuation against Mr. Ferris. Mr. Ferris is trying to clear himself of a charge that has not been brought against him.

Mr. FERRIS. Did you hear Mr. Nichols's statement?

Mr. WHITE. Yes. I think you are absolutely clear in the mind of Mr. Nichols and every member of this committee. I so understand it.

Mr. FERRIS. I take it you do, but it goes a little further than that.

Mr. WHITE. I want to say this: I do not care as far as the testimony of the soldier is concerned who may have inspired it, whether Mr. Harris is called or not. I questioned Mr. Lehmann and I want to say to you frankly, though very indiscreetly, that I regard Mr.

Lehmann as a very much better witness against this bill than for it. I questioned him myself and I intend to use his testimony. It is no doubt correctly sent down, although we have not access to it. I am satisfied and I am glad Mr. Lehmann appeared. If he came here as a champion to this bill, I believe that unconsciously—I believe that he came with an honest and absolutely disinterested purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. The preponderance of testimony here, so far as the number of witnesses is concerned, has been for or against the bill, would you say?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know. I am beginning to analyze that.

Mr. ELSTON. Will you say this: Don't you think we have given as full opportunity to the opponents of the bill as to the proponents?

Mr. WHITE. I will answer that question, Mr. Elston, in this way: I think the witnesses that have appeared here for this bill, if they might be so designated as witnesses for this bill, have been much more astute; they have had themselves better in hand; they have had a clearer idea of their testimony and how to present it; but I am perfectly satisfied, and I think those whose testimony has indicated that they were not so favorable to this bill in its present form, while not so clearly presented, not so perspicuously and explicitly, it has been received and fairly set down and I am satisfied.

Now you might have gotten the idea, from some of the questions I have asked, that I am not predisposed in favor of this bill as it stands. But that is not now a question for discussion; I will present that at the proper time. I do not want to use and have not used the time of this committee with irrelevancies; but I have followed the testimony as closely as any of you. While possibly not as well able to comprehend it, being untrained in matters of this kind in a congressional committee, I have done the best I could to follow all this testimony and I am satisfied with Mr. Lehmann's testimony. And at the proper time I will give it an analysis drawn from it as stated here.

Mr. RAKER. I did not complete my statement.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Ferris, before you leave: I want to say I have a very high personal regard for Mr. Ferris, and if there was anything in my suggestion that inferred anything antagonistic to Mr. Ferris, or questioning Mr. Ferris's integrity or sincerity in this, then I hope I will certainly not be understood in that way. Because I do not have any question of Mr. Ferris's sincerity in this proposition. But I do want to say to the committee in reply to what Mr. Elston says, that even Mr. Ferris appeared to think it would be a good thing to call another soldier. Even after we have heard all the people Mr. Elston says Secretary Lane submitted to us, Mr. Ferris thought it a good thing to hear another soldier and to close the hearings with the testimony of a private soldier, because we had not heard from a private soldier up to that time. Now, I wanted to ask Mr. Harris to appear, and I am surprised, and do not believe that the committee will refuse to hear Mr. Harris. And I want to ask seriously of this committee if they are not interested and do not think they should call a man before this committee if it is suspected that that man is representing a private interest that will have great gain as the result of the enactment of this law, and who has shown activity in spreading favorable propaganda to the soldiers regarding this bill—if Mr. Ferris and every one else on this com-

mittee does not think that this man should be asked to come here and say who he represents, and why he believes it is necessary to go around privately and induce soldiers to come before this committee in support of a bill that is aimed to aid the soldiers?

Mr. MAYS. Do you have any evidence that he persuaded, on his own initiative, this soldier to appear here?

Mr. NICHOLS. I have every reason to believe——

Mr. MAYS. What is the use of fooling away the time of the committee if you do not have any evidence?

Mr. NICHOLS. Shall I answer that question?

Mr. MAYS. You have not answered it yet.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have every reason to believe that Mr. Harris—I know that he talked to Mr. Lehmann and I know he talked to other soldiers in regard to this bill.

Mr. MAYS. That is not the question I asked you.

Mr. NICHOLS. What was it?

Mr. MAYS. The question I asked was, if you have any evidence that he, upon his own initiative, went to this soldier and persuaded him to come here?

Mr. NICHOLS. Let's get him here before this committee and find out.

The CHAIRMAN. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to have Mr. Nichols or anyone else attempt to draw any adverse inference from this situation that they please. As I understand, your view, Mr. Ferris, is against prolonging this hearing for this specific purpose, or for any other purpose.

Mr. FERRIS. That is it exactly. I leave my vote with the Chairman. There is a very short statement I want to read into the record before this hearing is closed, and I presume I will have the right to print that.

The CHAIRMAN. You will have the right to print that.

Mr. RAKER. I am in favor of expediting this matter as much as possible, but I want to say that I am going to ask permission of the committee to present a couple of letters showing that people all over the country are urging this legislation—chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and all kinds of organizations, women's civic clubs, women's organizations, and church organizations—doing what they can to inform the public of the real merits of this bill. And there is nothing wrong in that; it is perfectly right and proper. But the insinuation this morning is that Mr. Harris, not in a proper way, but in an improper way, induced this man to come before this committee because of some personal interest. Now, in justice to Mr. Harris, if he is the same man I think he is, who appeared before the Committee on Water Power, I saw him in town here two or three times myself within the past week, and I think in justice to him he ought to be given the opportunity to make a statement before this committee so that there can not be any implication against anyone in regard to this legislation.

Mr. ELSTON. Do you know Mr. Harris?

Mr. RAKER. I do not know if it is the same one. But he is from Montana, in relation to the Big Horn matter. He is here looking after a matter before the Land Department, and he appeared before the Water Power Committee and made quite a lengthy statement. He was introduced by Miss Rankin, and I think also by Senator

Walsh and by Senator Myers. And I just felt when this matter came up that there is really nothing for anybody to feel hurt about it, and so far as Mr. Ferris is concerned, his position is beyond question. Nobody could question it. But Mr. Nichols's charge is that Mr. Harris, as I would take it, improperly induced this soldier to come here. So far, nothing of that kind has occurred, and I would just like to see the hearings not closed with anything like that pending, because we have never had anything like that. But I believe there is something you did not get—it may not amount to anything on earth as far as this bill is concerned—but I just hope in the interest of harmony and in the interest of giving everybody a chance, and it won't take possibly 15 minutes, just to take care of that, that you will call Mr. Harris. I just offer that as a suggestion.

MR. SUMMERS. I would just like to inquire if Mr. Harris could be invited at this particular hour to come and answer the question?

THE CHAIRMAN. Personally, I do not know Mr. Harris; I do not know where he is nor his address. Do you know, Mr. Nichols?

MR. NICHOLS. I do not know Mr. Harris's address, but I can obtain it.

MR. RAKER. I am just advised that Mr. Harris was seen within 15 minutes, and I just make that suggestion as a matter of harmony and so as to leave no bad taste in anyone's mouth. I know of another matter of record like this and it was the very next day we got the whole thing in by the men themselves coming in before the committee, and they made a comprehensive presentation to be referred to by this committee and other committees in the Senate, and I imagine this is the way this will all turn out.

THE CHAIRMAN. Personally, I have no objection, Mr. Raker, but I did want to conclude the hearing, and to conclude to-day, with Mr. Hallam's testimony. But, in view of what Mr. Raker states, it may be best to have him appear before the committee.

MR. WHITE. Judge, prefatory to your remarks on the subject before the committee (the invitation to Mr. Harris) you stated that there was a great interest in this bill, a strong demand that it should be passed. Do you speak of the Mondell bill especially or do you speak of legislation for the benefit of the soldier?

MR. RAKER. May I answer in my own way, Mr. Chairman? To answer that intelligently, the general principles of the Mondell bill were in a bill presented to the House, reported by the Committee on Irrigation at the last session, and by the Committee on Public Lands, embodying the general principles, known as the Lane soldiers' homestead and settlement bill. The public were advised of the contents of that bill. The present Mondell bill contains a few additions that were not in that bill, and the other bills before this committee of Mr. Ferris, Mr. Taylor, myself, and several others embodied the general principle. So that the general sentiment, as I gather it from home, in talking with the soldiers, and talking with men, and from letters, memorials, and resolutions received from the West and other places, is that they are generally in favor of the provisions of the bill as promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, in substance now known as the Mondell bill, because the public has it by that name. And I will read a resolution here in answer to your question. Here is a

letter from the Consolidated Chamber of Commerce, of Sacramento, Calif.:

JUNE 16, 1919.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,

Congressman from the State of California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed copy of resolution adopted unanimously by our board of directors, which explains itself.

We are overwhelmingly and unanimously for this movement and know that it will bring great benefit to almost the whole of northern California.

This project seems wholly practical, and while there is apparently some opposition to it, this opposition is so small that it should not be permitted for a moment to stand in the way of the far greater number of people, especially in view of the fact that those who may be damaged will be protected, we believe, to their satisfaction.

It may be of interest to you to know that even in that section where there is opposition, or some opposition may develop, that they are not united. A great many people in that section, who are supposed not to favor the project, are either lukewarm or strong for it.

Yours, very truly,

CONSOLIDATED CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
H. S. MADDOX, *General Secretary.*

Resolved, That the consolidated chamber of commerce heartily indorse and approve bill (H. R. 487) introduced by Mr. Mondell, of Wyoming, to be known as the national soldier settlement act, and embodying the latest and most complete development of the great plan proposed by Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, looking to the reclamation of arid, swamp, and cut-over lands for the primary purpose of providing employment and rural homes for those who have served in the military forces of this Nation during the recent Great War; and it was further

Resolved, That we especially indorse and approve this bill in its present form as admirably drawn to enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the authority which it vests in him, to adequately protect and conserve the interests of soldier settlers upon lands to be reclaimed and developed under its provisions; that we favor the passage of this measure authorizing appropriation to the full amount of \$500,000,000 as proposed therein, and that we believe this vast sum is needed for this work and should be authorized at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior; to Hon. Frank W. Mondell, author of the bill; and to the representatives of California in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

J. LUBIN, *Chairman.*
H. S. MADDOX,
GEO. D. HUDNUTT.

That will answer the question directly and I think cover my answer fully. That is the general consensus of opinion.

MR. WHITE. That is the expression of opinion of the chamber of commerce. I am very glad to have that in the record, Mr. Raker.

MR. RAKER. Right in that connection I would like to read into the record, as bearing directly on this point, a letter from a man who is familiar with the West, who is familiar with the irrigation projects, and knows what such development means. I will insert it in the record or read it as the committee desires. But I know him personally; he is a man of great ability, and of great experience and learning. Without objection, I will put it in.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

STOCKTON, CALIF., June 2, 1919.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER,

Representative, Congressional Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I write you on behalf of Secretary Lane's soldier settlement bill and solicit your careful reading of this communication and your hearty sup-

port of the said bill, as its passage involves the material prosperity of a splendid section of California.

If this bill passes and the appropriation is made, it is proposed by the Department of the Interior to add a second unit to the original Orland irrigation unit in Glenn County, which is now under a United States Government irrigation system.

The new unit will put water upon an additional 20,000 or more acres of land which is now practically unproductive, or produces very inferior crops of wheat and barley occasionally, but which with water is already proven to be one of the best producing sections of varied crops in the entire State of California.

This second Orland unit proposed, being under the same management as the present unit and adjoining the present unit, will not be an experiment, and will be more economically developed and administered.

I was personally acquainted with the lands under the present Orland unit before the United States Government turned water upon them. It was a dry, barren, and gravelly soil, with an occasional thin wheat or barley crop. All the farmers were forced to possess and cultivate large holdings in order to make a living. At that time the land now under the Orland project had 50 owners, to-day, after 12 years, there are 750 landowners of that same section, with attractive homes and all prosperous.

The Orland section is to-day, as I saw upon a recent visit, one of the most beautiful and productive areas in all California, and water did it. Here you will to-day find in great abundance and of the finest quality crops of alfalfa, almonds, olives, oranges, lemons, grapefruit, prunes, peaches, apricots, apples, berries, and corn.

The dairy industry is rapidly developing, and the monthly output of butter alone is worth more than the annual yield of grain before the section was put under irrigation.

The Orland farmers are growing the finest breeds of live stock extensively because the food problem is solved by water. Cows hogs, and chickens are enriching their owners.

For the first three months of 1919 there was shipped from Orland carloads of produce as follows: Alfalfa hay and meal, 46 cars; grain, 29 cars; live stock, 46 cars; oranges, 1 car; butter, 233,600 pounds; poultry, 45,800 pounds; eggs, 54,640 dozen.

The population of the town of Orland as well as of the surrounding section has been largely multiplied by a splendid patriotic, industrious, and now prosperous citizenship.

Under the regulations governing the present Orland unit the land owners must reimburse the Government for the cost and maintenance of the irrigation system. All payments for building and maintaining the system have been promptly met, and in all the years not a single acre has become delinquent in its payment. This is a record unsurpassed.

What has been done in Orland unit No. 1 will be done in Orland unit No. 2 if you will support this bill and allow the appropriation.

The land proposed to be irrigated in Orland unit No. 2 is practically worn out, or otherwise useless for wheat and barley, but productive with water for both citrus and deciduous fruits.

There is water in abundance near by in the mountains west of Orland, and the preliminary surveys have all been made by the Government, proving that it is practicable to undertake the irrigation of an additional unit of 20,000 acres under United States Government regulation.

The Legislature of the State of California has already passed its cooperative bill as provided in the Lane soldier settlement bill, and the farmers in the section proposed to be irrigated are willing to sign up and agree to the plans proposed by the Government.

No plan would be more feasible and no place more suitable for our returned soldiers, sailors, marines, and others to locate than in this section suggested.

Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane strongly favors the plan to open a second Orland unit to irrigation.

As Representatives of California in our National Congress, I am sure we can count upon your hearty support of this measure by your voice and vote, that will materially aid in developing a splendid section of California, and encourage the settlement of these arid lands and inspire the development of irrigation projects.

For the sake of encouraging soldiers and others to purchase land and develop it on an easy-payment plan, as suggested in this bill, and in order to develop the great agricultural and horticultural interests of California, as a citizen, native of the State, I ask your hearty support of this bill and the appropriation provided hereby.

Very sincerely,

A. C. BANE.

Mr. BENHAM. I asked permission of Mr. Ferris before he left the room, and I now ask permission of the committee to have the letter sent to members of the committee, I assume by Mr. Ferris; that is, a copy of the letter received by him from a private soldier on this subject—I ask permission for that to go in.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will go in.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

DUNCAN, OKLA., June 12, 1919.

HON. SCOTT FERRIS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: I am a discharged soldier of the United States and I do not favor the plan for soldiers' homesteads as it now stands. I do not think it is practical, nor do I think it will ever prove satisfactory. We do not want to be torn up from our homes like the Arcadians and scattered anywhere over the United States. Nowhere have I talked with a soldier who favored the plan. Some of the men who have always lived in cities might like that plan; if so, let them have it, but for we soldiers who have farmed before and who have a farming knowledge of certain sections and communities, let us have ours this way:

Advance to us capital to buy a farm up to 100 per cent. (If the State can do that for its tenants, why can't the Government for its soldiers?) Fix a certain per cent as the amount to be paid each year and limit the years to 20, 40, or whatever seems best, and sell farms to the soldier on the installment plan, free of interest. If the Government don't look out, it is going to find that the States have taken several strides ahead of it and is doing more for its farmers than the United States is for its soldiers. I, for one, would rather get a home under the plan Oklahoma has worked out than under the soldiers' home bill as it stands.

Lend us the money for land and improvements, free of interest, but with a specified per cent to be paid each year. Let us choose the farm we buy and the community where we live, and you will find us satisfied.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. OWEN.

Mr. BARBOUR. While we are on this subject I would like to say that yesterday I received a telegram from the American Legion, which is a soldiers' organization in central California, heartily endorsing the Mondell bill and urging its passage. I will say that some time ago I sent this organization a copy of this bill with a very general description of its purposes and asked them to advise me as to their attitude toward it. This telegram came yesterday, I presume as a reply to my communication. I will read that telegram, or place it in the record, if it is desired.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be inserted in the record.

Mr. LONERGAN sent me yesterday a statement of the position of himself and his State toward this matter. If there is no objection to that being put in the record, I will hand it to the reporter.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

Gentlemen, the principle involved in the measure to grant to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines homestead rights, so that they may

gain a fresh start in life and be reasonably assured that the Government is behind them in their endeavors, should have the approval of everyone.

Having the honor to represent in part the State of Connecticut in Congress, I think it proper at this time to direct attention to the fact that there are acres and acres of land right in New England which can be profitably used by the Interior Department in the projects that will undoubtedly take form on the passage of soldiers' land legislation.

In Connecticut, for instance, plenty of land is available for sheep raising, which now is scarcely used for pasture land at all. The energy of our discharged service men plus the energy of a few tons of dynamite will in a short time obliterate rocks and stumps.

I am informed that nearly 1,900 former service men from New England alone have interested themselves in opportunities for reclaiming land, and their names are on record with the Interior Department. Of this number more than 300 live in Connecticut.

It seems to me no State should be overlooked, and New England and particularly Connecticut has special advantages that attract the former service man.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask that the statement of Secretary Lane, which appeared in the Sunday issues of the press of this city, go in here also.

Mr. BENHAM. If that is to be done, I would like to get half a dozen volumes of testimony against the measure and move that they go in the record also. I have some letters and a few telegrams, and I have read a good many articles. So if the record is to be enlarged indefinitely, I shall insist upon my right.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not put anything in this record yet, but we did ask Secretary Lane at one time to come before us, and he was busy and thought he had possibly gone over the matter pretty fully. And he did publish a very good statement, about a column or so, in the papers of the Sunday issue.

The CHAIRMAN. In the Star?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; and I feel that that ought to go in the record as a final statement of the author of this whole proposition.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think it ought to go in myself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will ask to have that go in.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me say another thing; that the State of Colorado, through the Governor and the public officials out there, have decided that they are going to call an extra session of the legislature to ratify the suffrage amendment, and they are putting it off until after this legislation is enacted for the purpose of passing such legislation and having the Governor include it in his call of the extra session, so that the legislature may enact such legislation for our State as will permit the State to take advantage of this measure and do whatever is necessary for Colorado to do its share. But because of the fact that they do not know what is going to be, they are putting off that extra session of the legislature for that purpose. And I may say that every man, woman and child in Colorado is in favor of this measure, and look at it in the way of a broad-gauge public measure as well as to take care of the soldier, and they expect us to do something here and expect Colorado to do something to help the soldiers, as she certainly will.

Mr. NICHOLS. In connection with the statement made by Mr. Taylor regarding Secretary Lane's statement, I would like to ask the chairman what became of the proposal made by this committee for the appearance before this committee of the Secretary of Agricul-

ture and the Secretary of Labor? It was understood before this committee at one time that both of these gentlemen would appear.

The CHAIRMAN. They were both invited by letter to appear.

Mr. NICHOLS. We heard they would appear.

The CHAIRMAN. I got a letter from the Department of Agriculture saying the Secretary was out of the city and would not return for three weeks. I have had no reply from the Department of Labor.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested here once or twice that the opponents of the bill had not received as full hearing as the proponents. Now I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have given opportunity to more Congressmen to oppose it. There was Congressman White, who had a full hearing; there was Congressman Boies, of Iowa, who had two full hours in opposition to the bill; there was a Congressman from Texas. And I do not believe that anyone will say we have not given fuller opportunity to the opponents of the bill and been more patient and given more opportunity than we have to the proponents. I do not see how any suggestion in the world could be made here that we have not given all possible opportunity to those who desired to appear against it. There was the Oregon man and this lady came, and everyone who had a criticism of this bill has been heard, and some very powerful people have come in to exploit it—Mr. Benham, your own representative from your own State of Indiana. We have heard all kinds of people here, and how it can be imputed that we have shut them off and at the same time shown favoritism to the proponents of the bill I can not imagine.

Mr. RAKER. Why not make the matter specific: Are there any people, or is there any man or woman who has made application to be heard on the matter pending here who desired to be heard and have not been heard?

Mrs. OXLEY. I am here. I do not know whether it is out of order or not, but I desire to be heard, and I know several soldiers who would like to be heard—a captain, two lieutenants and several others. If you would like to have their names I will furnish them.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state that Mr. Mays spoke to me about Gov. Spry, and someone else from Utah who desired to speak in favor of the bill. I told him the committee had made an order closing the hearing Saturday, with the exception of an invitation to Mr. Hallam to be here. And I told Mr. Mays that under the order his people could not be heard, although they were in favor of the bill. We have got to close these hearings some time.

Mr. MAYS. In that connection I will say the Governor has just arrived, and he did not know these hearings were to be closed until he got here.

Mr. RAKER. Governor Spry is here and from a long distance, and I would like to hear him myself.

The CHAIRMAN. These hearings have got to be closed up sometime. We have to take up the oil matter after this, and that may take long consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me make a suggestion; let us give two more days and let us tell these men who are opposed to this bill to go out and beat the brush and bring in everything under heaven they can find, and give them one day to present it.

Mr. ELSTON. They have had two to one already.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know; they have had three weeks. And then tell the proponents the same thing, if they want to present anything. And then limit them to three hours apiece and then quit, and if anyone wants to make any insinuations they are cut off after that time, no matter whether for or against the bill.

Mr. BENHAM. Would that motion also be supposed to allow the opponents of this bill to attempt in a legitimate way, to show what the hearings in favor of the bill have cost the United States Government and what the propaganda in favor of the bill has cost the United States?

Mr. TAYLOR. You can show any blame thing you please in three hours.

Mr. BARBOUR. My suggestion would be that we limit any further hearings we have to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. I fully appreciate your overindulgence but I maintain that they have had two to one already.

Mr. BARBOUR. I agree with you.

Mr. ELSTON. And they have put in every kind of argument; and if you cast up that record and estimate the number of pages, and the cost, you will find it is two or three to one in favor of the opponents.

Mr. BARBOUR. I agree with you.

Mr. RAKER. We have had before us a great piece of constructive legislation that will do more for this country than anything that has occurred for the past 50 years. And suppose it does cost something to get it ready and suppose it takes a little time to hear it, why shouldn't we give the opponents and proponents a little time to be heard, and we will give legislation that the people of this country want and which will do good. And there is no reason to be technical in regard to closing the hearings. Let us bring this Mr. Harris here, and let us have another day's hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state to the committee that the clerk has attempted to locate Mr. Harris but has failed to do so; so we cannot get him to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will renew my motion, Mr. Chairman, that we give the opponents three hours more time to present anything under heaven they want to, and after that by the proponents, those in favor of it (they have a right to close the hearing anyhow), that they be given three hours to close if they want it. I do not think they will want any time; at the same time I do not want to shut this thing off with a row and with people sitting here saying they want to be heard. I do not know what they want to say, and we can keep these hearings up for six months longer, and there will still be a lot of cranks and people from all over the United States who want to be heard.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say one word: Like the man in the parable, I am of age and I can speak for myself, and I am satisfied. I have not asked any man to come here, except a member of my delegation. And you know those fellows said "Hayes, we won't come; we are satisfied to go ahead; we will agree to anything you report." That was nice and fine; I was a new man. Now, I am satisfied. Mr. Elston looks over at me with a scowl on his face and inspires my soul with terror as I see his countenance in my sleep.

Mr. ELSTON. Oh, no, Mr. White, that is my ordinary look of profundity.

Mr. WHITE. Then it is God's fault and not yours, I am satisfied. This matter is going along nice; I do not care who comes here, I will get just as much out of this as anybody. I think we have the best case and you have the best witnesses, and you have the advantage of us in that respect.

Mr. ELSTON. I think you have done very nicely.

Mr. RAKER. I do not think this is a matter that ought to depend on the number of witnesses or the number of hours but ought to depend on its merits and if it takes a little time, let us take it and then adjudicate the case on its merits and not on the number of witnesses or on how much time it took or how much it cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of Mr. Taylor is that the opponents have three hours and then the proponents three hours.

Mr. MAYS. I understood that Mr. Taylor's motion contemplated the opponents of the bill should be heard for three hours and then those in favor of the bill should be heard for three hours.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that was the motion.

Mr. MAYS. Following out that motion, and knowing the governor is in favor of the bill, I suggest that we carry that idea through, and those opposed to the bill be heard first.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any opponents of the bill here who desire to be heard?

The committee will be glad to hear you, Mrs. Oxley. Please state your name and address and whom you represent.

STATEMENT OF MRS. W. H. OXLEY, 1819 G STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. OXLEY. My name is Mrs. W. H. Oxley, 1819 G Street. I represent myself and some friends of mine and my relatives and family who became indignant about this Lehmann statement. I brought the piece with me, and Mr. Ferris and Mr. Nichols brought it up—it seems as if they have read my thoughts and read this article in my hand. Reading this in Saturday's Post, my family and myself and a lieutenant who has been discharged, and several others, were interested in helping the soldiers—not helping any plan—because when I first read Secretary Lane's plan I thought it was a good one, but since reading Mr. Morgan's plan and what Canada is doing for her soldiers, which I think everybody knows—I didn't know it until yesterday, when a Canadian told me what they were doing—it seems that the Morgan plan would be the wisest.

Canada is giving her soldiers \$100 a month for 6 to 12 months, depending on length of service in France and rank; a 160-acre section in any part of Canada the soldier selects, and \$8,000 for improvements is loaned to them without interest.

Now, that is being done, and some of our soldiers are very much interested in getting to Canada if they can, because their Government is not doing it.

I can give the names of several soldiers who think that this loan bill is by far the best plan for them, and when we read this article of Mr. Lehmann's—Private Lehmann, Company D, 326th Infantry, we

were quite indignant, because it says he entered the committee room seeking information regarding the proposal, and then he was called on to testify as to what this bill was. Why anybody who had just come in for information could be brought up as a witness—it killed the Lane bill in my mind almost immediately. The first thing I said was: "There is a Democrat working for Mr. Lane." Now, I didn't know Mr. Ferris; I tried to see him yesterday, and when he went out I spoke to Mr. Ferris as he went out, and I told him what I had said, which was not very complimentary. He said: "I am working for the Lane bill." I said: "That is what I said yesterday." So you see it really works against the Lane bill.

Now, I have the names of all the soldiers that I have interviewed. I interviewed a stranger on the train this morning, and he said he was an officer, just from France, and he was in favor of some plan to help the soldiers, and if you are working to help the soldiers that the bill which proposes to bestow on him some money—which-ever bill it was—is the one to be of service.

Now, I have two or three soldiers that I have asked if they will come up here, one a lieutenant in the Census Building; one a lieutenant in the Aviation Corps—Now a captain and in the real estate business—and I think they would be very glad to come up and tell what they think is for the benefit of the soldiers and not for either bill, if you care to have the witnesses brought up.

Mr. NICHOLS. Have you their names and addresses?

Mrs. OXLEY. I could get them for you.

The CHAIRMAN. You might tell them we would be glad to hear them.

Mrs. OXLEY. You will be glad to hear them?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mrs. OXLEY. Is there any special time you have put down for them to be here?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will probably have a meeting to-morrow at 10 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. I want to ask this lady a question, Mr. Chairman. Did you ever talk with Mr. Morgan, the author of the Morgan bill?

Mrs. OXLEY. I went to Mr. Morgan yesterday. I tried to see Mr. Ferris and I tried to see Mr. Snell, and I couldn't see any of them, except Mr. Morgan just a moment.

Mr. WHITE. You went to Mr. Morgan of your own motion?

Mr. OXLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. On your own impulse?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Now, I want to bring out, Mr. Chairman, because I hate to have people come up here and say there is some interest back of this, and I want this witness to understand that this committee wants to be absolutely impartial and fair, and hear everybody.

Mrs. OXLEY. That is what I want; to be perfectly fair. I went to Mr. Morgan yesterday and told him I wanted all the literature he had, and I am going to Mr. Lane and ask him for all the literature he has, because I asked the Rector of St. Paul's if he would throw his influence to the bill that was best for the soldiers, and he said he didn't know anything about it, but if I would bring him the literature on both bills he would study up the question and do what he

could. So I came down yesterday morning to see Mr. Morgan, and I got his literature, and I am going to Mr. Lane today and get his literature and turn it over to the Rector of St. John's and St. Paul's, and Epiphany, and ask them to throw their influence to the bill that is best for the soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. You want the very best legislation we can secure for the soldiers?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes, sir; like Canada is doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you read all the bills?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes; I have read all the bills.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know whether that statement in the newspaper was true or not, do you?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes; Mr. Ferris just said so.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read the statement:

Mrs. OXLEY (reading):

Pvt. Emile Lehmann, Company D, Three hundred and twenty-sixth Infantry, was a witness. He entered the committee room seeking information regarding the proposal, and Representative Scott Ferris, Democrat, of Oklahoma, insisted that he take the stand. Mr. Lehmann was reticent and said, "Well, it looks as though it was a mighty good thing." That was the most he would say.

We were indignant about it, because he didn't know anything about what he was talking about, and why a committee of men like these should ask an ignorant soldier to come and be a witness to——

Mr. MAYS (interposing). He knew how he felt about it, didn't he?

Mr. VAILE. Did you hear the testimony?

Mrs. OXLEY. I heard what Mr. Lehmann said.

Mr. WHITE. Now, for instance, if we took only those who knew most about it, how much do you know about it?

Mrs. OXLEY. I have studied it for months. I wrote the first letter that was written about soldier settlement to Theodore Roosevelt when the first army had entered France, because my husband and myself were going to Florida on a farm—it seems to me I heard the name "Hallam" this morning—I wrote to the Hallam Land Co. and I told them—I spoke to the Hallam Land Co. and I told them I had written to Mr. Roosevelt suggesting that the Red Cross or some other Christian association should form a fund where we could place our helpless soldiers on farms, and I suggested Florida—I am going there and will be perfectly willing, as a good agricultural worker interested in this work, to show my ability by what I can raise and not just what I know. And after the Hallam Land Co. didn't carry out some of the promises they made I dropped all connection with them, but in a month or two afterwards Mr. Lane's idea of putting the soldiers on the farms came out, and after I read it I said, "Well, I'm glad somebody is taking that up," and I wrote to Mr. Theodore Roosevelt about it, and Mr. Roosevelt wrote back a very nice letter saying the idea, he thought, was excellent, but he was not in either health or business condition to take up any extra work.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Oxley, you haven't talked to Mr. Mondell, the author of this bill, have you?

Mrs. OXLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't read the testimony of Mr. Lehmann, have you?

Mrs. OXLEY. Only what was in the paper.

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't read his testimony?

Mrs. OXLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And you didn't hear it?

Mrs. OXLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And the thing you are indignant about is the statement in the paper and not his testimony?

Mrs. OXLEY. An ignorant soldier was taken by the committee to represent——

Mr. VAILE (interposing). How do you know he was an ignorant soldier?

Mrs. OXLEY. He was ignorant of the subject; he may have been a learned scholar, but he was ignorant of the subject.

Mr. VAILE. You say you haven't read his testimony?

Mrs. OXLEY. I say from the paper I was indignant. Of course, if I read his testimony I might not be.

Mr. VAILE. Of course, that is only the story of it by the newspaper reporter in the paper.

Mrs. OXLEY. That is all I have.

Mr. VAILE. Don't you think it is a little unfair to characterize him as an ignorant soldier when that is all the basis you have to go on?

Mr. WHITE. The lady qualified her statement, Mr. Vaile.

Mrs. OXLEY. The paper said he had just come in here and didn't know anything about the Lane proposition; that he had just come in here and hadn't had time to study it. I have studied it for months and I don't know all about it yet.

Mr. VAILE. If you had read Mr. Lehmann's testimony you would realize that he had studied not only this bill, but that he had studied the proposition very sensibly and had discussed it with a great many soldiers.

Mrs. OXLEY. I didn't know that, of course.

Mr. VAILE. Furthermore, that he had visited all kinds of lands in different parts of the United States.

Mrs. OXLEY. I am very glad to hear it. It made me indignant that you would take the testimony of some one who had not studied the subject.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask one question, Mr. Chairman. You have read the Lane proposal in the Mondell bill, haven't you?

Mrs. OXLEY. I have read the Mondell bill.

Mr. RAKER. Now, have you read the statement of Secretary Lane on the bill?

Mrs. OXLEY. Well, I have read a great many statements of the Secretary.

Mr. RAKER. Have you read his statement given before this committee?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes; the one that was in the paper.

Mr. RAKER. Now, let me ask you this question: Are you in favor——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Just a moment, Judge—she said the statement in the paper.

Mrs. OXLEY. That might not be true, of course.

Mr. RAKER. I mean the hearings. Have you read the hearings before the committee, the testimony given by Secretary Lane?

Mrs. OXLEY. No; I have not.

Mr. RAKER. Having read the Mondell bill, having written to ex-President and Col. Roosevelt, having gone into the matter thoroughly in regard to the protection of the returning soldiers, are you in favor of the Mondell-Lane proposition to care for our returning soldiers?

Mrs. OXLEY. No; I am not now. I used to be. I am not now because Lieut. Fair, of the Census Bureau, said and explained to me very carefully that it places the soldier in the position of a day laborer. I hadn't thought of that before.

Another lieutenant of the Aviation Corps—his name has slipped my mind for a moment—thinks it is an outrage to the soldiers, and I would like for them to come up and testify.

Mr. VAILE. Is the soldier compelled to assume the position of a day laborer?

Mrs. OXLEY. No; but they are very anxious—this Lieut. Fair is a soldier from Texas—he has a Representative here—and he is very anxious to get a farm. He hasn't the money to do it; he is getting a small salary at the Census Bureau, and he was brought up a farmer's boy, and he is a farmer.

Mr. VAILE. Then, if they are very anxious to undertake this labor, it certainly is not a hardship on them to do what they are anxious to do, is it?

Mrs. OXLEY. But he wants to go right in to planting corn and cotton in Texas and buy himself a farm for \$4,000.

Mr. ELSTON. He wants the Government to give him 160 acres and lend him \$8,000 without interest?

Mrs. OXLEY. No; he is willing to accept \$4,000 and buy the farm for \$4,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he wants to have it all improved and a garden patch planted on it?

Mrs. OXLEY. Whatever he can do.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you in favor of the Canadian plan, Mrs. Oxley?

Mrs. OXLEY. Well; I really haven't studied the Canadian plan. This was just the statement given to me about what they are doing.

Mr. MAYS. You say they are loaning \$8,000 without interest to each individual?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. Do you think that is true?

Mrs. OXLEY. They say so.

Mr. MAYS. That they are loaning \$8,000 to each individual without interest?

Mr. TAYLOR. Who says so?

Mrs. OXLEY. The young Canadian that gave this statement. I can find out the truth about it if you like. I can send a telegram right direct to Canada, if you like.

Mr. SUMMERS. I have a copy of the law here, Mrs. Oxley, and so far as I can learn there is no country that is offering to loan more than \$2,500 to a soldier. That is the Canadian law, and at least one Province in Australia, and that was what I wanted to call attention to.

Mrs. OXLEY. This may be some land scheme, like Secretary Lane's. I don't know what it is. That was just given to me as a statement from a Canadian.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think we ought to loan them \$8,000?

Mrs. OXLEY. Not until they got established on the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would then?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. You mean that that \$8,000, or whatever sum is fixed, would be the purchase price of the farm, don't you? You don't mean that he would have that amount to start into business with?

Mrs. OXLEY. For improvements; buying the farm and improving it.

Mr. MAYS. That wasn't what she said.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I thought that was what she meant. I think my question was fair.

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean, Mrs. Oxley, to lend them \$8,000 to enable them to secure a farm and the improvements?

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes; I think that would make the best citizens of our working boys of anything in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. And they to secure that farm wherever they can find it?

Mrs. OXLEY. Wherever they please, without any restrictions, whether it is improved land or unimproved. If they want to get 6,000 acres out here from the Government, unimproved, let them go and improve it if they want to.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the lady one more question. I gather from all your testimony that you are in favor of the best bill that can be framed that will do the most for the soldiers that need it and are in a position to avail themselves of it.

Mrs. OXLEY. I am in favor of the best bill for the greatest number of our soldiers, which will help them the quickest and the best.

Mr. WHITE. And that will help those that stand in need of it.

Mrs. OXLEY. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. But you would be opposed to any bill for the benefit of soldiers if it also involved the reclamation of arid lands or swamp lands, as I understand it?

Mrs. OXLEY. No; if they wanted to go and do it; but I think a great many don't want to do it. If they want to go ahead and drain swamp lands, I say go ahead and do it. I think it is a very dangerous thing to do, because I have some swamp lands in Florida myself; but I believe with President Wilson in the principle of self-determination, and go ahead and do the best you can with what you have got. If they want to go into the uncultivated swampy land of Florida, let them buy up the whole thing. For \$8,000 they could buy quite a good deal before this land scheme came up. Everything has been raised way up now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else here who desires to be heard?

Mr. RAKER. Let us hear Gov. Spry now.

The CHAIRMAN. The opponents of the bill were to have three hours commencing to-morrow, and then the proponents of the bill were to have three hours at the close. If there are no other witnesses here we might stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. MAYS. Where is Mr. Harris?

The CHAIRMAN. We are trying to locate him. We will try to get him here to-morrow.

Mr. MAYS. I would be glad to hear Mr. Nichols's statement as to the evidence he has—as to calling Mr. Harris.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have made my statement.

Mr. MAYS. That is all you have?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The order made was that commencing to-morrow the opponents of the bill shall have three hours and then the proponents shall have three hours.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, was my motion put, or was it carried? Is it the understanding of this committee that Mr. Harris shall be requested to come before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding is that Mr. Harris will be requested to come before the committee to-morrow morning.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Chairman, I have here a short resolution from the Spanish War Veterans that I would like to have incorporated in the record. I don't care to take up any time reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. RAKER. Do they want this bill to include them?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is that the national organization?

Mr. SUMMERS. The national organization. They are asking that it apply to the Spanish War veterans.

Mr. BENHAM. We would like to know who it is that is speaking for the Spanish-American War veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose it is a resolution requesting that they be given the benefits of the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS (reading):

We recommend that the foregoing resolution be passed, same being unanimously passed by the Sixteenth Annual Encampment of United Spanish War Veterans, at Bellingham, Wash., June 13, 1919.

It is the State organization of the United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. BENHAM. That is what I wanted to bring out, where they are located. Doesn't that represent the national sentiment of that organization? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think Mr. Benham misunderstands. This is in favor of including the Spanish War veterans in the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BENHAM. I understand that.

Mr. SUMMERS. They declare they are in favor of some such legislation, as far as that is concerned, and they want to be included in the provisions of the bill.

(The paper referred to follows:)

Whereas the State of Washington enacted into law at its last session of the legislature acts in compliance with the request of the Secretary of the Interior empowering this State to avail itself by way of acquiring land and co-operating with the Federal Government on the reclamation of same: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Washington and Alaska United Spanish War Veterans at its sixteenth annual encampment is in thorough accord with the policy outlined by Secretary Lane, and earnestly requests our Senators and Representatives in Congress to aid in every way with the early passage of an

act in furtherance of the said plan, thereby enabling returned discharged soldiers to secure a home in this State if they so desire; and be it

Further resolved, That we recommend that the proposed bill be amended so as to extend the benefits thereof to members of the United Spanish War Veterans organizations and to veterans of the Civil War.

We recommend that the foregoing resolution be passed, same being unanimously passed by the sixteenth annual encampment of United Spanish War Veterans, at Bellingham, Wash, June 13, 1919.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here from the Orland Unit Water Users' Association on the Government project in California that pertains to this bill. Now, if the members of the committee want me to read it, I will, or I will have it inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it may be inserted in the record.

(The paper referred to follows:)

ORLAND UNIT WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION,
Orland, Calif, June 7, 1919.

HON. HUGH S. HERSMAN,
Representative, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We, as directors of the Orland Unit Water Users' Association (a Government project), wish to express ourselves as being in hearty accord with the bill H. R. 487, recently introduced by Representative Mondell, and further known as the national soldiers' settlement act.

After some 12 years of actual experience with irrigation at Orland, Glenn County, Calif., in the Sacramento Valley, we fully appreciate and realize the value of water.

Prior to irrigation the farmers were becoming more and more involved financially, owing to the light crops of cereals produced on our practically depleted soils, but since water was available our farmers are quite prosperous.

At the beginning, some 12 years ago, we had 50 landowners under our project, to-day we have 750.

We have always met our financial obligations with the Government on time. We have never been compelled to foreclose on a farmer on account of delinquent water-tax assessment. Our slate is clean.

We never hear of any real estate foreclosures under our irrigated areas, but to the contrary with the dry farmer.

The pioneers under our project have been amazingly surprised as to the results from irrigation.

What has been accomplished here with water can be accomplished correspondingly elsewhere.

We consider bill H. R. 487 as being the most worthy of all agricultural bills ever introduced before a United States Congress. If there was ever a time in the history of our country when rewards of merit were due those who so valiantly defended our rights it is now.

Therefore we who are experienced in the reclamation of arid or semiarid lands heartily indorse the movement of Hon. Franklin K. Lane and regard the bill herein referred to as being the foundation for the greatest agricultural and humane undertaking on record, and sincerely hope and trust your personal support will be recorded in its favor.

Yours, for the bill,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
ORLAND UNIT WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION,
By P. D. BANE, *President*.
FLORENCE M. BALDWIN, *Secretary*.

[SEAL.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how soon the printed hearings will be available for the members of the committee, if you are able to state.

The CHAIRMAN. The first and second volumes are available now.

Mr. WHITE. I would like it if we could postpone any executive consideration of this bill until we could have those hearings before us.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we can have the hearings completed and in print within two days after we close our hearings.

Mr. WHITE. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further business we will stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11.30 o'clock a. m., the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, June 25, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 25, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a paper here, a statement of mine, which I should like to file; or shall I read it?

The CHAIRMAN. I think you had beter read it.

Mr. FERRIS (reading):

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before the hearings close I desire, first, to congratulate Secretary Franklin K. Lane on the plan he has evolved to aid the returning soldiers in their desire to acquire homes; second, I desire also to congratulate him upon his untiring efforts in seeking to reclaim the arid and waste lands in the Western States and convert them into habitable homes for the soldiers. All of this is so commendable on his part, moved by such patriotic motives, that even words of commendation with reference to him are surplusage and wholly unnecessary.

I desire to congratulate the chairman of this committee, Mr. Sinnott, for his untiring devotion in presenting this bill and absolute and undaunted fairness he has accorded every witness, whether he be for or against the measure, together with his uniform courtesy to every member of the committee.

I desire likewise to congratulate Mr. Mondell, the Republican floor leader, who has entered into the spirit of this legislation with the undaunted spirit to bring about, first, the reclamation of the arid lands of the country, and, second, to make possible the acquirement of homes by the soldiers.

I desire likewise to congratulate each and every member of this committee, who day after day at great inconvenience to himself and at neglect of other important matters has sat patiently through these hearings and heard everyone who desired to be heard. No one, either now or in the future, can but feel intensely proud of the great interest manifested by every member of this committee.

Other matters connected with my duties as a Representative in Congress have made it impossible to be present all the time during the hearings. With this in mind I feel I can not let these hearings close without stating, first, that I am heartily and earnestly in favor of the Lane plan, in so far as it goes, and in so far as I deem it in all things feasible; but at the same time I must express a feeling of confidence that in order to do full justice to all the soldiers, and in order to be in all things feasible in every section of the country, and in order to be free from the charge of favoritism and sectionalism, that it may be of the highest and greatest use in the greatest number, it deserves amendment in the following particulars:

First. A provision should be incorporated in the bill providing that the money appropriated either by this bill or hereafter in succeeding bills should be equitably divided among the States according to the soldiers contributed by the States to the war; also should be available to soldiers of prior wars.

Second. In States where the soldiers' colony plan is not feasible, and in my judgment there will be many such States, due to high-priced land and closely-settled communities, an alternative proposition should be offered, whereby the soldier can acquire a home, either urban or farm, by procuring a substantial loan from the Federal Farm Loan Board or some similar appropriate agency

that will articulate with the Interior Department in order that the soldier may acquire a home in a given community under proper safeguards and proper restraints independent of the soldiers' colonization plan.

Third. Opportunity should be afforded for such soldiers who do not desire to avail themselves of either the colony plan or Federal Farm Loan Board plan by direct loans from the Federal Government to enable them to be applied on the purchase of a suitable and appropriate home for each and every homeless soldier, who desires to avail himself of a home—subject, of course, to restraint on alienation—subject to actual occupation of the home, and other safeguards that will free the undertaking from fraud or bring about the actual acquirement of homes for the homeless soldiers.

Fourth. Substantial modification of the homestead law should be made, dispensing with the collection of fees for making homestead entries on the unoccupied public lands of the country. Provision for suitable temporary loans to properly improve such public-land homesteads made upon the public domain to the end that they may be habitable and result in a successful undertaking by the soldier homestead occupant; also rigid requirements of residence, cultivation, and improvements should be reduced and modified to encourage the soldier in acquirement of a home.

Mr. Chairman, it is intensely important that we do not allow this great constructive measure with proper amendments to fail. We must not fail. We must not use up all of our energy on details and forget the great duty we owe to the soldiery in granting them this relief, which if it does not miscarry will furnish countless homes for homeless soldiers in all of the States of the Union.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, you have reserved three hours for each side in this hearing, and I would like to have 30 or 35 minutes before we close. I want to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, Mr. Harris is here this morning. I will say, Mr. Harris, the other day we had before us a soldier, who made a statement. His name is Lehmann, and it was intimated that this young man—intimated by Mr. Nichols, or stated—that this young man, who was apparently a very fine young farmer soldier, was unconsciously being made use of by a man representing private land interests in the West—men who have private interests and private gains at stake in the enactment of this bill—and you have been invited before the committee for the purpose of making a statement of your relations to Mr. Lehmann, whether or not you instigated him to come before this committee to make a statement, or if you came with him, why you came here with him, or why you sent him here. The committee will ask you some questions about that.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN J. HARRIS, PRESIDENT OF THE BIG HORN IRRIGATION & POWER CO., HARDIN, MONT.

Mr. HARRIS. I am frequently down at the Knights of Columbus Hut, down on E Street, and naturally I meet quite a number of the soldier boys there, and naturally I take to the boys that are from the West. I can almost single them out, you know, and they know that I am from the West, and sometimes they approach me, and in connection with this soldier-home bill I have had quite a number of inquiries by reason of the fact that the boys know that I get up to the Capitol at times, and I have given them what information I could. My feeling in the matter has been to help them wherever I can in getting information, and in this case, in connection with this man Lehmann, I think it was last Friday night that I met him there and the only time that I met him.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you happen to meet him? Tell the committee everything about your meeting him.

Mr. HARRIS. As I recall—of course I couldn't say definitely, but in effect I recall that I met him there at the Knights of Columbus—I don't know whether there were several of us speaking there or not, and he was among the crowd—but anyway, I learned that he was from the West, and I asked about his services across, and so on—some things of interest, naturally—and he told me then that he was going to his parents in West Virginia somewhere and that he was going out West, and there had been several other boys previous to that, however, that I had given some information in regard to coming up to the Public Lands Committee here to get some data on that bill, because I didn't know the status of it, and they had brought some down there for some of the other boys. So I told this young man that in the morning if he wanted to go up—I asked him if he had been to the Capitol, and he said no, and I told him then that I would be glad to go up with him in the morning, and to meet me at my place and I would help him get what could be gotten on the matter. So I came up here then and called in your office adjoining here, Mr. Chairman, and they said there were hearings on, and I asked if it was possible to listen, and they said yes, it was an open hearing, and I brought him in here, and then I left. I sat here about 10 or 15 or 20 minutes, or such a matter, listening and he remained.

So that is the sum and substance of my acquaintance with the gentleman. I haven't seen him since he was here, but my whole interest has been—I am not interested in lands; I have no lands to sell to the Government; my business has been mainly in private lines—yes, entirely so. The only thing that I want to see is that private initiative can go ahead and have its way and get away from this Government business, so far as lands or anything else is concerned. Of course, I like to see the West develop, and anything that I can do in that regard is going to be done at all times in the general interest.

The CHAIRMAN. You are interested in water power development, I understand?

Mr. HARRIS. I am interested in water power, irrigation, and railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. You appeared before the Committee on Water Power last year?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Before this committee?

Mr. HARRIS. Before the Committee on Water Power. But I want to make this statement that I will be only too glad when we get something done along that line so I can get back home and get to work. I am a long way from home, about 3,000 miles, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. Has your company any lands that you expect to turn over to the Government if this bill is passed?

Mr. HARRIS. No; none at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nichols, do you want to question the witness?

Mr. NICHOLS. You talked to Mr. Lehmann. Did you suggest that he come down here and make a statement?

Mr. HARRIS. No, sir. The fact of the matter is, I thought the status of the bill at that time was—I had a general idea, if I had any idea at all—that the thing was about wound up and that he could get what literature he wanted and get the matter in pretty complete form, probably—that is, if he would ask for information.

Mr. NICHOLS. Haven't you talked to other soldiers about it?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely. They have asked me down there at the Knights of Columbus Hut about it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Haven't you gone to soldiers on your own account and brought the subject up with them of the soldier-land bill? Have not you brought it up yourself with the soldiers without them coming to you?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think so.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will you say that you have not in the Knights of Columbus Hut?

Mr. HARRIS. Definitely I could not say. It may have been this way, that there may have been several there and somebody would ask me while I was talking to others that put the question.

Mr. NICHOLS. Isn't it true that you have brought this subject up yourself?

Mr. HARRIS. Not that I recall, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will you say it is not so?

Mr. HARRIS. I could not say definitely, but not that I recall.

Mr. NICHOLS. Isn't it a fact that it is well known among the boys around the Knights of Columbus Hut that you are very much interested in this soldier land bill and that you have been generally talking this soldier land bill around the Knights of Columbus Hut to such an extent that it has become a well-known fact that you are interested in this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Not from any other consideration except the consideration I just enumerated.

Mr. NICHOLS. I didn't say the consideration; I just asked you the question.

Mr. BARBOUR. I suggest that the witness be allowed to answer the question.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, is this gentleman on trial for having committed some crime? If not, I don't think these questions should be asked.

Mr. MAYS. Let him ask anything he pleases.

Mr. BARBOUR. I don't object to the witness being questioned, but I would like to see the witness answer.

Mr. SUMMERS. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, if he, down at the Knights of Columbus or Young Men's Christian Association or any other place, has presented this matter fully to any and every soldier, I believe he was only doing his duty and nothing beyond that.

Mr. BENHAM. That doesn't seem to be the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLS. I would like to continue my questions.

Mr. BARBOUR. I suggest that Mr. Nichols go ahead with the questions.

Mr. HARRIS. I will answer the question that I am interested as any man would be interested in the development of the country and getting something for the soldiers. Beyond that I am not interested at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. But haven't you made yourself conspicuously active in the interests of this bill, so that it was generally understood that Mr. Harris of Montana is very much interested in the adoption of this measure?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I couldn't say that, outside of the viewpoint I just presented.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, Mr. Harris, do you live in Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. I live in Montana.

Mr. NICHOLS. Whereabouts in Montana?

Mr. HARRIS. What part of Montana? The southeastern portion.

Mr. NICHOLS. What is your business?

Mr. HARRIS. Water-power development generally—water power, irrigation, and transportation.

Mr. NICHOLS. How long have you been in Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I have been here just about six weeks, and previous to that I was here—I have been here off and on for the last two years. I have been here between Washington, York, and Pennsylvania, for the past two years.

Mr. NICHOLS. You have been coming to Washington for a number of years, haven't you?

Mr. HARRIS. The first trip I made here was in 1914 in connection with water power, and then in regard to the nitrate plant. They had hearings before the War Department one time in regard to locating a nitrate plant somewhere, and they considered the West in that connection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Are you in the employ of somebody?

Mr. HARRIS. Just our company.

Mr. NICHOLS. What company?

Mr. HARRIS. The Big Horn Canyon Irrigation & Power Co., Hardin, Mont.

Mr. NICHOLS. What is its business?

Mr. HARRIS. Power, irrigation, and railroads. Of course, we haven't built any; we are waiting for legislation.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is this a subsidiary company connected with other companies?

Mr. HARRIS. No; we have no connections to-day, and we can't get any financial connections until legislation is had on water power.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean water-power legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. Irrigation, of course, is an incident to the power. We build a dam for power, and irrigation is incident to it.

Mr. NICHOLS. You are in Washington now.

Mr. HARRIS. In Washington; yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. As a lobbyist for water power?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely no. I am here as a general manager and president of our company, and we have no work in Montana now. Our work is all here. It is not in Montana, because we are stalled.

Mr. NICHOLS. Are you a lobbyist?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not a lobbyist; no, sir. The fact is, I receive no salary, and I have had no salary for several years.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you represent any concern in New York City?

Mr. HARRIS. Only in this way: Mr. Hugh L. Cooper is the consulting engineer of our—on our—project and Gen. Goethals.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is all I have.

Mr. RAKER. I have just a couple of random questions. Mr. Harris, in addition to appearing before the Committee on Water Power, did you have any matter before the Department of the Interior in regard to application for rights to construct your dams, etc.?

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, yes; the maps and all that matter have been filed, as is usual in a case of that kind. We have had a great deal of work with the Interior Department.

Mr. RAKER. You are generally interested in proper legislation, to the end that the water power of the country might be developed?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; so much so that we can't do a thing until there is legislation enacted.

Mr. RAKER. Now, have you been familiar with the West to some extent?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I think probably as much as it is given to the ordinary layman to be familiar.

Mr. RAKER. How long have you been out there?

Mr. HARRIS. I have been out there in the Northwest since 1906.

Mr. RAKER. Are you anyways familiar with the cut-over lands of the Northwest also?

Mr. HARRIS. You have reference now to the timberlands?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Not so much so. In our eastern territory we have very little of that—in the eastern part of the State.

Mr. RAKER. Are you anyways acquainted with the cut-over lands in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin?

Mr. HARRIS. No; as to those lands, I am only acquainted in a general way.

Mr. RAKER. You are in no ways acquainted with the unoccupied and uncultivated lands of the Southern States, the swamp lands there?

Mr. HARRIS. Not to be able to give any information that would be of value.

Mr. RAKER. Are you acquainted with irrigation projects in the West conducted by the Government?

Mr. HARRIS. Very well, indeed.

Mr. RAKER. Are you anyways familiar with the irrigation projects in the West under private development and ownership?

Mr. HARRIS. I am.

Mr. RAKER. Now, have those projects, to a greater or less extent, been a success?

Mr. HARRIS. It so happens that in my observation projects which have been conducted by private parties in the main have been more successful, by reason of the fact that they were in close touch with the situation governing the case. The Government, of course, is far-fetched and full of red tape ordinarily, and unless it is a tremendous big project that private parties could not go into, that would not be a commendable thing, don't you see—of course, in very large projects it so happens that you have got to take water sometimes for 100 miles before you can use it, and there the Government, of course, can do the thing where private parties could not.

Mr. RAKER. What I want to know is, generally speaking, from your personal observation—you are in that line of work to a greater or less extent—whether or not they have developed the countries or territories that were unproductive before to such an extent that they are now successful?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, indeed; very much so. The Government has—I will state, for instance, the Huntley project, east of Billings about 12 miles, is a very successful project. Of course, gentlemen, I want you to have this impression, too, as I make that statement, the thing governing that condition there is sugar beets, and it is the most

successful sugar-beet country, I think probably, that there is in the Northwest, and that, of course, entered into the situation very largely and really made that the most successful reclamation project that the United States Government has.

Mr. RAKER. Well, is there more land out there that could be successfully irrigated, that is not irrigated now, that is open, unoccupied, uncultivated land?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I want to make this statement, gentlemen: In 1904 the United States Government made a survey—the Reclamation Service—for the irrigation of 46,000 acres of ground, and then after more thorough investigation, and by reason of the lack of reclamation funds, they abandoned the project. That very project we will cover with our power project—that is, we will increase the acreage from 46,000 acres to 70,000 acres—and the irrigation becomes an automatic part of our project. You see, while you are raising water for power, we raise it for irrigating the ground, and that is where we automatically build up about a million and a half dollars' worth of irrigation while we are building power; so, while it wouldn't be a practical proposition for them, it is for us.

Mr. RAKER. Outside of the special matter you speak of, generally over those Western States is there a large quantity of land that is susceptible of irrigation and cultivation if water could be obtained?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; very much.

Mr. RAKER. Well, now, you have looked over this Lane bill and are somewhat familiar with the general situation. I will ask you to state to the committee if, from your observation and experience, you believe that this bill will be workable and will be a great benefit for the United States if enacted into law?

Mr. HARRIS. I want to say this, that I saw a page or two of the bill, and probably read the first five lines of it, and that is all that I have seen.

Mr. RAKER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENHAM. Just one question, Mr. Harris—

Mr. HARRIS (interposing). Just one moment before you put your question. Finishing my answer, the idea, in my opinion, is a good one. I think it is a splendid idea to get the land in that way for returning soldiers. I don't care where it is; I think it is a good thing because I find this true with them—I have a brother that is serving and he left his business and went into the Army and came back and he wanted to go West. He was not satisfied with things any more. I figure that very many of them are unsettled, and this is a thing that is likely to appeal to them. They want to get somewhere else. It is hard for them to go back to business, and that offers an opportunity for such as want to change their location, etc. I think the bill offers very good opportunities for such men as that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Harris, of course if a great deal of money is spent in irrigating Western arid land, your corporation and all other corporations of that kind would benefit, either directly or indirectly by it?

Mr. HARRIS. You are very correct about that. I made this statement, that every bit of land brought into cultivation in the West creates a national asset or a State asset that is helpful throughout the State and throughout the Nation. There is no question about that.

Mr. VAILE. And it would not only be of peculiar benefit to the corporations engaged in irrigation work, but to the whole industry of the country.

Mr. HARRIS. Not the corporation—I think that should be eliminated. I mean the public at large.

Mr. NICHOLS. Why do you eliminate corporations? Because you represent them?

Mr. HARRIS. The situation is, I think it is for the people at large.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Incidentally, do you not think it will be helpful in industrial centers of the East? For instance, the city of Detroit would be greatly benefited if we would develop the West so that they could send in automobiles and threshing machines and mowing machines.

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely. Even Wall Street, New York, for instance, if there are objections from there—

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). You are getting nearer home—

Mr. HARRIS (interposing). We have got to come East to finance and so on. You gentlemen know that very well.

Mr. NICHOLS. How are you interested in the city of Detroit?

Mr. HARRIS. Whether I would be or not, the proposition would still be the same. Of course, there are many interests in the country that would be prosperous.

Mr. NICHOLS. The truth of the matter is that you represent a private corporation?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely.

Mr. NICHOLS. And you are in favor of this bill, the general purposes of it?

Mr. HARRIS. The general principles of the bill; yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. To such an extent that you have talked it over with quite a number of soldiers, and one of those soldiers that you discussed it with came here and made a statement.

Mr. HARRIS. I told him to get his information up here at the Public Lands Committee; that they would probably have it and would be able to enlighten him. I didn't have anything on it.

Mr. MAYS. Did he ask you for information or did you first approach him?

Mr. HARRIS. He asked me for information, as I recall it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Harris, how did he come to ask you for information?

Mr. HARRIS. I couldn't make that statement definitely.

Mr. NICHOLS. Why should he ask you for information?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, he was over in France, and you know he had lost touch with the United States and was going to Virginia and then going west.

Mr. NICHOLS. You don't think that he heard that you took a great interest in this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Now, he may have heard from the boys there—I don't recall—the boys that I had spoken to.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You do not think that you did anything wrong to impart information to the soldiers, do you?

Mr. HARRIS. No; oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Nor that you ought to apologize to anybody for talking to these men about anything you want to talk to them

about? Did it ever occur to you that you would be brought up here and cross-questioned for giving out information?

Mr. HARRIS. I want to say—

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). Now, just a minute—are you answering my question or Mr. Smith's? Who is questioning?

The CHAIRMAN. You were questioning him first, but Mr. Smith broke in.

Mr. BENHAM. And we ought to know on whose time he is to be questioned by Mr. Smith.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did anybody ask you to apologize? Did I ask you to apologize before this committee?

Mr. HARRIS. No; and, gentlemen, I want no apologies. I think it very—

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). Mr. Smith suggested that.

The CHAIRMAN. Let him answer the question.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, the question—I have lost track of that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through on that line?

Mr. NICHOLS. I was asking Mr. Harris regarding how this soldier came to ask him, but Mr. Smith interrupted—how the soldier happened to come to him.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not recall.

Mr. NICHOLS. And I asked you—

Mr. SMITH (interposing). You had better ask the soldier that question. Is he here?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; he is not here.

Do you know how he happened to come to you?

Mr. HARRIS. Do I know how he happened to come up here?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; to you personally.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, as I say, as I recall, I met him at the entrance of the Knights of Columbus Hall.

Mr. NICHOLS. You said he came to you and asked you.

Mr. HARRIS. As I recall; yes. We were speaking, however, of other matters, you understand, and I learned that he had come from across the water; I learned that he was from the West, and naturally he was asking questions, and I feel that he asked me. I couldn't say definitely. Of course I know this much, that I was willing to impart any information I could.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think that he came to you because it was generally understood by the boys around there that you were interested in this proposition?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that question is relevant at all, because how can he know what induced the soldier to come to him?

The CHAIRMAN. I think he can answer the question.

Mr. HARRIS. I say, I have that idea, that he got his information from the boys around there, that probably I knew a little something about it, or could put him wise to where he could get some information.

Mr. ELSTON. Was there any understanding between you and the soldier that he should come up here and represent a particular line of argument that you suggested to him, and in a way be your representative here, and an agent to misrepresent the opinion of the soldier? Did anything like that pass between you?

Mr. HARRIS. That idea is absolutely wrong, because the soldier boy just came up here to get this information.

Mr. ELSTON. The imputation here was that this is some kind of a cooked up deal between you and the soldier, by which he came up here and you were attempting to put over something.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is perfectly unfair.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, Mr. Nichols, that implication—that is not invidious, but you have implied that as a fact.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have not implied that the soldier was in the deal. What I said specifically was that unconsciously the soldier was being made use of, and I repeat what I said.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, then, I will make—

Mr. NICHOLS (interposing). I said “unconsciously” the soldier—I am perfectly satisfied with the soldier.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask Mr. Nichols a question, if I may. Who, in your opinion, was making use of the soldier, either with the soldier’s consciousness or without? Who was making use of him?

Mr. NICHOLS. The people that Mr. Harris represents, and people that I can’t tell you now all the names that he does represent, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, what do you think Mr. Harris—what does your information disclose that Mr. Harris sought to do with that soldier? What was in your mind? All I am trying to get at is what was in your mind as to what Mr. Harris did with that soldier, and I say to the committee frankly that I ask this question for a purpose, because I had something to do with that soldier myself after I got up here, and I want to get it straight in my mind. What is it, Mr. Nichols, that you think Mr. Harris actually did to bring about any misuse of that soldier, or any use of him at all, other than a perfectly proper one?

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, I don’t know that I care to make any statement at this time before the committee. Mr. Harris is up here to answer questions and I am asking questions. He stated specifically that he represents a private corporation that has an interest in having this bill enacted, because it means so much to the particular section of the country that this corporation is doing business in, and that they are very much interested in seeing this bill enacted.

Mr. FERRIS. Is there anything wrong about that, Mr. Nichols?

Mr. NICHOLS. I think it is wrong if Congress and a congressional committee is endeavoring, sincerely and earnestly and conscientiously, as I think this committee is, to enact a law, the purpose of which is to aid the soldiers to own a home and to readjust themselves after this war—I think that it is wrong and it has a suspicious surrounding altogether that private concerns are showing a deep interest in the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MAYS. Have you shown anything like that?

Mr. FERRIS. Where is the proof of that?

Mr. NICHOLS. The proof of it is right here in Mr. Harris. He told you who he represents.

Mr. BARBOUR. Not on this proposition, though, Mr. Nichols.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; but generally in Washington. He tells you who he is employed by.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nichols, do you think it is part of the overt act that he brought this gentleman up here to get the information?

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, the general disposition is to help to put this over if they can.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all that appears, that he brought this soldier into this room, and the soldier sat here and engaged in a conversation with Mr. Ferris, the former chairman of this committee, and Mr. Ferris on his own initiative invited the gentleman, the soldier, to testify before the committee. What I am trying to locate or discover is the overt act of this conspiracy—alleged conspiracy.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, if you gentlemen want to laugh at it, you go ahead and laugh at it, but I tell you it is a mighty interesting thing and it is a mighty suspicious thing, in my mind. Whether it impresses any of you gentlemen or not, it is a mighty suspicious thing that we have at least traced one private corporation from the far West that will benefit by the enactment of this legislation, whose representative he is.

Mr. MAYS. In what way will they benefit?

Mr. NICHOLS. He testified that.

Mr. MAYS. In what way?

Mr. NICHOLS. He testified to it, and you look it up—that they. It is suspicious that they should show an interest in putting this legislation over, to the extent of having one of their agents, at any rate, show a particular interest in this legislation.

Mr. MAYS. I want to ask a question there.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hersman has been endeavoring to get the floor.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Harris, did you know that there was a hearing going on before this committee, where the soldier could testify?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I didn't know a thing about it. I haven't been to any hearings.

Mr. FERRIS. Did you ask the soldier to come up here and testify?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely, no.

Mr. FERRIS. Now I was not here yesterday and I may be a little insistent about this, but I think that a statement is due here from me. I don't know whether the committee will hear me or not—

Mr. VAILE (interposing). I think it is due from Mr. Ferris.

Mr. FERRIS. Absolutely that soldier had no more intention of making a speech before this committee than I have of addressing the Versailles conference. I went right over there and sat down by him and asked him his name—I had never seen him before—and asked him if he knew anything about this bill. He said a Young Men's Christian Association concern in France had explained it to him, and that he was interested in it. I said, "Would you like to say a word about it?" He said, "I can't talk. I never spoke on my feet in my life." I said, "I have heard something of the terms of this to-day, and they explained it to me over in France." Then I said, "Wouldn't you like to say a word before the committee?" He replied that he wouldn't mind if we wanted him to, and I went over and suggested to the chairman that he be called on, and the reason I state this is that I don't think we ought to get a man, Mr. Harris or anybody else, up here and cook up a lot of surreptitious imaginings and try to make something out of it. That soldier had no in-

tention whatever of addressing the committee, and I went and arranged with the chairman to have him address the committee if he would. I called on him myself to make an address. I never saw the soldier before; I have never seen him since, and I never spoke a word to Mr. Harris on the subject in my life. I stated yesterday that I had never seen Mr. Harris; I think I saw him before the Water Power Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. And you did not know what he was going to say, whether he was for the bill or against it?

Mr. FERRIS. He told me there that he thought he was for the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Does his testimony, Mr. Ferris, show the earmarks of a slick, insidious propaganda?

Mr. FERRIS. Absolutely not. This whole thing is a tempest in a teapot that does not reflect credit on this committee.

Mr. WHITE. He never stated that it did, Mr. Elston. He stated repeatedly and consecutively a dozen times that nobody thought the soldier had any such purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Mr. Mays has the floor.

Mr. MAYS. I started to ask a question of the witness. Mr. Nichols has just stated that this propaganda has been traced to one private corporation which would be peculiarly benefited by this legislation. I want to ask Mr. Harris if his corporation would be benefited peculiarly by this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely no; not any more than any other corporation wherever a project of the kind might be located, or something of that kind.

Mr. MAYS. Do you have any land that you thing possibly might be bought by the Government upon which a project might be instituted?

Mr. HARRIS. No; the Government in our Territory has no land for sale in the first place, that I know of. It is Indian reservation around there, in the main.

Mr. MAYS. Does your company have any land that you might hope to sell?

Mr. HARRIS. No; no land at all.

Mr. VAILE. Have you any water that you could sell to the Government for these or other lands in that vicinity where the water could be used?

Mr. HARRIS. Under existing conditions out there to-day as to our irrigation feature, we would be able to increase the irrigation area about 70,000 acres by gravity and probably 40,000 acres by lifting. But that land, gentlemen, is owned by whites and by Indians to-day, and they, probably, of course, would see to it that they had water for the land, you know. It would be a beneficial proposition, provided the water was cheap enough.

Mr. SUMMERS. Mr. Harris, isn't it a fact that if 70,000 acres of irrigated land there under private ownership was put on the market, and this bill was enacted, that this would come in direct competition with that? If this Mondell bill were enacted and there were other projects opened up all over the United States, I say that would come in competition with any private projects?

Mr. HARRIS. Naturally the territory would have to stand on its merits.

Mr. SUMMERS. I believe Mr. Harris very fully understands that he has a right to talk to one soldier or to every soldier for or against this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Or about any other bill or subject.

Mr. SUMMERS. Or any other person. And the impression is being given over and over again that when a man goes out and talks to a soldier in regard to this bill that he is doing something improper, and I maintain that he is only exercising the rights of an American citizen, and when he goes out of his way to talk this to a soldier he is only doing a patriotic duty toward that soldier and toward his country. If he believes in the bill, well and good; if he is opposed to it and steers a soldier away from it, he is doing the same thing, and regardless of which side he is on, I don't think that any improper motives ought to be imputed to that man for talking to soldiers if they want information. They have been trying to get it in France; they are writing to me from my part of the country in regard to it, and wherever you go—I was in New York the other day, and they were asking me up there in regard to this bill and what it meant, and when there would be land available and all those things, and I think I had a perfect right to give them the fullest explanation of which I was capable, and I don't think that this is a proposition that is going to benefit any particular part of the country. There has been some reference to Detroit and its automobiles. I will say for the information of the committee this morning that in Yakima County in the State of Washington, where we have 140,000 acres of irrigated land, they are running more than 5,000 automobiles, whereas they possibly would have been operating 300 or 400 without that development, and it is benefiting the soldier back in Detroit just the same as it would benefit a soldier some place else on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gandy, do you desire to ask a question?

Mr. GANDY. I don't desire, Mr. Chairman, to ask the witness any questions, but as one member of this committee, I do want to say that the time has been limited and it doesn't occur to me that it is fair in the least for this committee to take up all the time with one witness here, and if you will pardon the expression, wrangling among ourselves as to this or that or the other, and we ought to have some definite time for each witness and go ahead with him. There are other witnesses that want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it was the desire of the committee to be pretty liberal with this witness. He is really not a witness; he is under investigation.

Mr. NICHOLS. You might say under suspicion.

Mr. WHITE. I want to ask the witness some direct questions.

Are you pretty familiar, Mr. Harris, with the agricultural conditions in the State of Montana at the present time? How about Fergus County, for instance?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know about that.

Mr. WHITE. Well, how long has it been since you have been in Montana?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, of course, I am in touch with it every day.

Mr. WHITE. Did you ever live there?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I lived there since 1906. I homesteaded there.

Mr. WHITE. And you are pretty well acquainted with the topography of the country generally?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. You know, Mr. Harris, that the bench lands of Montana are being continually developed, that they are finding small tracts of land that a few years ago were thought to be not important enough for agricultural purposes, but that land is naturally well watered and they are raising enormous crops all through those bench lands—almost a sure thing. They raise 45 bushels of wheat to the acre. You know, too, that those farmers are making good profits, operating very successfully; that they are buying trucks and transporting their products to market on the Milwaukee and the other roads that penetrate that country. Do you know if there are numbers of segregated tracts of land that are for sale throughout the State of Montana, this productive land, in small tracts, 80 acres or 100 acres, or 160 acres? Can you answer that question?

Mr. HARRIS. I will answer it in this way, that land is changing hands very much there all the time; yes.

Mr. WHITE. Well, you regard those segregated tracts, then, as a good investment? They have a commercial value fixed on the basis of their revenue-producing power?

Mr. HARRIS. Any land in the Northwest that is good land is growing in value.

Mr. WHITE. That is true all over the United States. Now, I want to ask you this question, Mr. Harris. We will say, for instance, that a young soldier that has returned from the war, who, we will say, enlisted from Montana, from one of these districts, and he wants to go into business. Having only a small capital, do you think that if he could buy a tract of this land, selecting it from his own personal knowledge of the adaptability for the products they raise there, and the Government would loan him a percentage of the purchase price, would he have a good prospect to succeed?

Mr. HARRIS. Why, I feel so. I think he would.

Mr. WHITE. Well, don't you believe that he would have as good a prospect to succeed as he would have under a Government project? He would have the advantage, Mr. Harris, of having a thorough familiarity with the local conditions. He would have the advice of his father and his friends.

Mr. HARRIS. There is this difference: Of course, you would benefit in one respect but you might lose in another. As I understand the plan of the Government, it is to get a community together. Now, he might have to buy an isolated tract in order to get what he wanted. I will explain that. We will say, for instance, here is an Indian allotment that was barren, nothing doing there; he bought an adjoining tract—

Mr. WHITE (interposing). Now, my question applies to the case where there is an opportunity to buy by this land; make a selection that will be satisfactory to the soldier.

Mr. HARRIS. Still the difference is there. The difference is that by somebody taking the lead and laying out and planning a project on a large scale, it would make the project a more successful proposition than where the party went out and selected a piece of ground isolated from transportation, etc. There would be that difference.

Mr. WHITE. I am speaking about these remote tracts being connected by truck travel and automobile with all these stations along these railroads.

Mr. HARRIS. He would naturally go to the place where the land was cheapest, and that would be isolated. That is the general proposition where the fellow hasn't got funds, you know.

Mr. WHITE. But you say there are plenty of those tracts and they are for sale and are changing hands constantly?

Mr. HARRIS. Either plan, in my opinion, is a good plan.

Mr. WHITE. And those lands are worth what they cost, based on the well-known sagacity and business judgment of land speculators and buyers and sellers?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all, Mr. Harris.

Mr. BARBOUR. I would like to call up the remark made by Mr. Nichols a moment ago, that, as it goes into the record, leaves it in rather an unsatisfactory way. Mr. Nichols said that this witness was under suspicion. Am I correct, Mr. Nichols?

The CHAIRMAN. He was expressing his own opinion.

Mr. BARBOUR. I wanted that to appear. I didn't want it to appear that that was the opinion of the committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. Under suspicion so far as I am concerned.

Mr. VAILE. I might add that I don't think that he is under indictment, so far as I am concerned?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; nor under suspicion, so far as I am concerned. Now, I have heard this discussion, and I haven't heard a thing or a word that warrants any suspicion against Mr. Harris. Now, would you mind stating, Mr. Nichols, the reason why he is under suspicion with you? I think that is due in fairness to Mr. Harris.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, now, supposing you ask the other members of the committee who have said he was under indictment.

Mr. BARBOUR. That was a joking remark.

Mr. VAILE. I just explained that remark.

The CHAIRMAN. Does Mr. Nichols care to answer that question?

Mr. NICHOLS. You want to know why I think he is under suspicion?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; your reason for that statement, why he is under suspicion by you. I think that is only fair to the witness.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think the witness is deeply concerned as a representative of the corporation that he says he represents here, the Big Horn Investment Co.

Mr. HARRIS. The Big Horn Canyon Irrigation & Power Co.

Mr. NICHOLS. That as an agent of this corporation—

Mr. HARRIS (interposing). As an officer. I am president and general manager of it.

Mr. NICHOLS. You are the representative here of that corporation?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; the only representative.

The CHAIRMAN. President and general manager, he states.

Mr. SUMMERS. But he doesn't come here, does he, Mr. Chairman, in the capacity of an officer in a corporation? He comes here because he was asked to come.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, I will continue, and say that as a representative of this corporation he has shown an interest in the enactment of this legislation, and I think it is a very suspicion thing—a sus-

picious thing to me—that a private corporation, with a representative in Washington, who has appeared before various committees regarding the development of the western district—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Water power.

Mr. NICHOLS. Water power—should show as much interest as it appears here he has shown by talking to numbers of soldiers regarding this legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. Have you concluded?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. That answers my question.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to just make a few remarks.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask one more question. The question I want to ask you, Mr. Harris, is do you believe that in a case such as I have indicated that the young man with an experience in agriculture throughout a lifetime should buy a tract of this segregated land, that it would be a safe thing for the Government to loan him a part of the purchase price, so far as solvency on the part of the Government is concerned? Would it be a good bet for the Government?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, it would in the main, I think. Of course it would depend then on the man. It would depend also on the territory.

Mr. WHITE. Certainly it would depend on that. I admit all that.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to make a statement for the gentleman here—

Mr. BARBOUR (interposing). Do you mean Mr. Nichols?

Mr. HARRIS. That when the war broke out we had many men in our territory that went to the young fellow who was going to war and patted him on the shoulder and said, "How I envy you that I am not in your place." The soldier went across the water, a young fellow taken not at his own volition to go into the Army, but he went because the Government wanted him to and put him in. I don't feel like the fellow that did the clapping on his shoulder, and said, "How I envy you." I have always had a sympathy for the boys. Some of our engineers had to go over there, and especially is that true of the men coming from the West; that they had just made a start, and they quit everything and went away to war, and if I can do anything in any way to help them along I am going to do it, and that is my motive in probably showing an interest in the soldier boy. I don't want to be hypocritical about it, but he has always had my sympathy.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Harris, if I may ask you one question, do you believe that they should help all the boys that went to the front, that went to the Army?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the Government in its discretion will know best how to handle the matter.

Mr. NICHOLS. You say you are interested in doing something for the soldier who went to the front and whom we all honor.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly am interested.

Mr. NICHOLS. We all are. Do you think that we should do something for all of them?

Mr. HARRIS. I think we should do the things that judgment would suggest we do to help the situation along.

Mr. NICHOLS. I know, but you are showing an interest, as you undoubtedly have, in the soldier. Now are you in favor of enacting legislation that will attempt to give Government aid to all of the approximately 4,500,000 men that were in the Army and Navy?

Mr. HARRIS. To the extent that it would encourage the boy to get out and make good for himself, and in that way make good for the Government and increase the national credit. We have got debts enough, and we ought to reduce it. To that extent we ought to encourage the soldier boy to go and make good.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know how many soldiers could be aided by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, if it should only be able to provide for approximately 100,000, do you think it would be a good bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Any bill that will provide for helping 100,000 boys in a practical way, I consider that a good bill.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would you believe in giving some Government aid to all the soldiers?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the Government aided them to get away from their work and should aid them to get back. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is fair to this gentleman—I have never seen him before and know nothing of him, but I think it is fair to him for the committee to say that he has acquitted himself admirably before this committee; that he has shown no interest whatever in this bill except such interest as would be prompted by his patriotism, his love for his country, and the soldiers, and I would not think it proper for him to leave this committee feeling that the committee felt that he had acted suspiciously at all, and so far as I am concerned, I think his conduct is beyond suspicion.

Mr. ELSTON. You make a motion to that effect?

The CHAIRMAN. I think your statement is true. I think it is a case of "trifles light as air that jaundiced minds become confirmation strong as truths of Holy Writ." [Laughter.]

Mr. ELSTON. You make that motion?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. I second the motion, that this witness be relieved of suspicion.

Mr. RAKER. We don't want any motion; the committee is using its discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Gentlemen of the committee, under a rule made yesterday, three hours' time will be devoted to the opponents of the bill, to be followed by three hours from the proponents of the bill. Now, we are ready to hear the opponents.

Mr. FERRIS. You mean, Mr. Chairman, general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the rule was that the hearings would be extended three hours to the opponents of the bill and three hours to the proponents of the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Was that done yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. That was done yesterday; yes.

Now, the regular order of business is to hear some one who is against the bill. Is there any witness in the room who is opposed to the bill? If so, he may step forward.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I have a witness here who is against the bill as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you introduce your witness, Mr. Gandy?

Mr. GANDY. This is Mr. Jeffries.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your name and whom you represent, and your residence?

STATEMENT OF MR. HUGH JEFFRIES, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN MILITARY REFORM ASSOCIATION.

Mr. JEFFRIES. My name is Hugh Jeffries, president of the American Military Reform Association. My residence is Danbury, Wis.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. With what organization were you connected in the Army?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The Twenty-third Regiment of Engineers, L Company, A. E. F.

Mr. GANDY. Before you start, for the benefit of the record, will you state the position that you were in before you went into the service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am a highway engineer, engaged in highway work under the Wisconsin Highway Commission for about four years previous to enlisting in the Twenty-third Engineers, which is the highway regiment of the Army. I was in 1916 and 1917 secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Highway Commissioners Association.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You are now a sergeant?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I was a sergeant; yes, sir. I am discharged from the Army. I have an honorable discharge.

Mr. GANDY. And just further, for the record, before you start in, you saw service overseas and at the front?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; I was with L Company of the Twenty-third Engineers, and we went through the Lorraine front with the Rainbow Division early in May of 1918, and were in the zone of action continuously until after the armistice was signed. We were in direct contact with and along with 10 different combat divisions, and saw them in action.

Mr. GANDY. Now, Mr. Jeffries, if you will permit me, if you are not in favor of this bill as it stands, tell the committee why and what amendments you would favor.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I wish to state to the committee that I have been—I have taken part in a great many discussions and informal conferences among the soldiers in regard to this proposition, both in France and in the United States. I will say that I represent no private concern in any way, shape or form, but I do represent a great many soldiers who are very deeply interested in this proposition, and I know from my own personal knowledge and contact directly and indirectly with about 300,000 of these soldiers—I know something of the questions which have arisen in their minds and have been propounded in regard to the feasibility and the advisability and the applicability of this proposed act, and I have prepared a list of questions, questions which have been asked of me and asked of others many times in regard to the bill, 10 in number, and if you have the time, I would like to take up particularly two or three of these questions. Now, what is your pleasure, gentlemen?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to hear him.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Shall I read the entire list?

Mr. JOHNSON. Read whatever you want to.

Mr. JEFFRIES. These are questions of the enlisted man.

No. 1. What assurance has the enlisted man that in the administering of this plan the employment of ex-Army officers in desirable salaried positions would not be fostered without regard for real ability and merit?

I think that is the first question in the mind of the enlisted man nearly always. We have seen a great deal of favoritism and patronage. We have been very closely held by a governmental system, a military system in which it has been brought very forcibly to our notice, and that we are afraid of.

Mr. RAKER. Just what do you mean by that, Mr. Jeffries? In what particular line?

Mr. JEFFRIES. In the administering of the act, an organization would have to be either expanded very considerably, or a new organization, new bureaus created.

Mr. RAKER. You mean that under the provisions of section 3, lines 4 and 5, page 3: "The Secretary shall, so far as practicable, utilize the services of soldiers for such purposes" that the Secretary would not use the services of engineers and men like that who had been in the service, but would take those who are now in the service in preference to them?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I don't wish to be taken as implying that that would be done by the Interior Department or by any department which would handle it. I don't wish to imply that, but I say that that section—we would like an answer to that—an assurance, some kind of an assurance that this favoritism would not be shown, you see.

Mr. RAKER. I catch your point.

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is the idea.

Mr. RAKER. Well, is it your view that the Secretary should be directed positively to employ the soldiers in all the work—surveying, engineering, and electrical work, and house building, and all?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is our idea that a real merit system should prevail, regardless of enlisted men, officers, or whoever it is; but a real merit system should prevail.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Jeffries, would you like to continue to make your statement—to make a complete statement and then answer questions; or do you want to answer them as you go along?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is at the pleasure of your committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. I just wanted to know what your idea was.

The CHAIRMAN. You might get your questions into the record first, Mr. Jeffries, so we will have them in consecutive order in one place.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Very well [reading]:

No. 2. What protection has the purchaser in his equity in the land in case he desires to dispose of same prior to acquiring title? Has not the Secretary of the Interior full power to prevent transfer of any kind whatsoever without the necessity of even explaining why he refuses to sanction the deal?

No. 3. Under the provisions of the bill, what is offered in the way of assistance to the soldier who desires to acquire and develop land which does not happen to be included in a project which has been approved and acquired under the provisions of this act?

No. 4. Does this act admit of the expenditure of any portion of the fund for administrative purposes or for preliminary investigations or the making of surveys and plans?

No. 5. What assurance have we that in the work of improving and developing the land a real merit system under which ability, application, and initiative

shall be promoted to the highest degree and the evils of political and other forms of patronage be minimized?

No. 6. Is any provision made whereby the counsel, advice, and desires of the settlers in matters affecting the policies of administration as to projects in which they are directly interested may be availed of, and whereby those most interested may be sharers in the responsibility of management of the undertaking, through the exercise of a stockholder's vote when policies are to be determined?

No. 7. After Congress has appropriated money under the provisions of this act what supervisory powers has it over its expenditure?

No. 8. Has not the Secretary of the Interior absolute power of veto as to any and all undertakings or operations under this act?

No. 9. Is it not entirely possible that a great deal of favoritism might develop in the administering of this act, and that it places tremendous power in the hands of a few political appointees who are far removed from the people and not directly responsible to the Congress?

No. 10. What is to insure an equitable distribution of the funds appropriated? [Applause.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Did you have any assistance or suggestions in drafting this questionnaire?

Mr. JEFFRIES. As stated, I have prepared this list of questions personally from the conferences I have had with soldiers.

Mr. GANDY. In this connection I want to say that Mr. Jeffries came to me voluntarily yesterday and we had quite an extended discussion of it, and I asked him to go back and put into writing the questions that he asked of me, and assured him of an opportunity to be heard, and that is the result of it.

Mr. NICHOLS. We are deeply indebted to this soldier for putting up questions to us that are of great importance. I think he is the best witness we have had.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further to state in your opening statement, Mr. Jeffries?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I should be very glad to take these matters up and have any of the members ask questions. I shall be glad to answer as best I am able any questions that occur to you.

The CHAIRMAN. You are through with your opening statement?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. Now, I want to ask, Mr. Chairman—you are familiar with the provisions of this bill that is before the committee, are you not?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. And you are familiar with the fact that it contemplates the development of projects, so called?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. In so far as it goes, with certain safeguards and amendments, do you approve the bill?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I approve of the purposes of the bill very strongly; yes, sir—of the purposes.

Mr. GANDY. Then you think there should be added to it the alternative provision of individual selection and assistance?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. You are familiar with the South Dakota law?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. GANDY. Do you think that some alternative along that line for cooperation with the States, or individual selection, should be specifically provided for?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; and I have some definite proposals to put before this committee for their consideration, whereby I think the bill might be strengthened and bettered, and whereby I think that the confidence of the people and of the soldiers in the bill, which is very necessary to the successful consummation of the purposes of the bill, might be compelled, where, as it now stands, I absolutely know that the bill is viewed with suspicion by a great majority of the soldiers. I know that.

Mrs. GANDY. Now proceed with your suggestions.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I ask you before you do that what you mean by the suspicions the soldiers have toward the bill?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; I will say that there is a very unusual state of mind among the soldiers, produced by a very unusual condition of government under which we have lived—existed—for many months, and there is a universal lack of confidence in individual and departmental efficiency and integrity. And so in regard to the distribution—and as I have stated before, in regard to the proposition of the selection of the help—the doubt arises in the minds of these men, and it is expressed among themselves—that is, between themselves where they speak as equals and are equally interested—a doubt as to the possibility of anything governmental ever being administered fairly and efficiently. Now, that is a state of mind in the Army yet, and it continues for a considerable period after the men come out, and for this reason they do view with suspicion any proposition that comes from any department which proposes to do good things for the soldiers, because they are afraid there are strings to it. That is the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON. What do you attribute that to?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The despotic authority which all officers have in the military organization.

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean the Regular Army or the National Guard?

Mr. JEFFRIES. All the Army was the same, I think.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, you said awhile ago there had been discrimination. Did you mean discrimination for or against the National Guard in forming the Regular Army?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I don't mean between the different units in the Army; I mean discrimination against the enlisted men in the Army, and by officers of higher rank against officers of lower rank, including the entire Army, all of it, every department that I came in touch with, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now you are not speaking for the private. You are speaking for the officers, as I understand it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Enlisted men are privates and noncommissioned officers.

Mr. JOHNSON. Also noncommissioned officers?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would say, sir, that there is in our military system a wide line of demarcation between the enlisted man and the officer. The assumption is all the way through—and it is carried out—that the enlisted man is possessed of neither honor, intelligence, nor ability, and that the officer is possessed of all of those requisites only to a degree commensurate with his rank.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with you on that, sir. I don't indorse that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Jeffries, of course, you understand the military branch of the Government would have nothing to do with administering this law, and if you are familiar——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). Now I would be——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Just wait a minute, Judge. He is putting a question to the witness.

Mr. RAKER. I am going to object to the question until the witness gets through.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. He said he was through.

Mr. RAKER. All right; I withdraw it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Are you familiar with the administration of the reclamation law by the Interior Department?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. To any extent?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Well, there is no suggestion that there is any person put in authority there that was not equipped for the position?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am not making any implications, sir. I am stating—trying to state to this committee—the actual facts of the state of mind of the soldier, and I want to say to this committee, when the bill is enacted by this Congress it must be in such shape as will go the very farthest possible way toward compelling the confidence of the soldiers; toward answering these questions in the bill and leaving as little as possible of these various questions to be answered by the individual act of the Secretary of the Interior or any other individual head of the department. I will say for your information that I do know a great deal about the reclamation; that I was a member of the committee that helped draw, I think, the first draft of the reclamation bill, and I have lived a long time in that country out where they have done this reclaiming, and I am personally acquainted with Frederick H. Newall, who was the first director, I believe, and I know positively that there is no comparison between the administration of the Reclamation and the Forest Service and the military service, but a great majority of these men whom you seek to satisfy and to benefit don't know what I know. They have these doubts.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't have them yourself?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Sir, I have less confidence now in the infallibility of individuals than I had before I went overseas.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are speaking about your experience in the Army and I understood you to commend Mr. Newell and the Reclamation Service.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That you knew yourself about the Reclamation Service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. There is no comparison between them.

The CHAIRMAN. But the boys didn't know, and they naturally would be suspicious from their Army experience?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. According to your viewpoint?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not criticize the Reclamation Service yourself?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not. It is a grand thing.

Mr. MAYS. Then your criticism awhile ago or statement to the effect that the soldiers very generally doubted the integrity of all departments, was directed more to the military than to anything else, was it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think it is induced by this very close association with the Department of War; yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And their experience has been with the officers in the Army, and through that experience they have become suspicious of the whole Military Establishment? Is that it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes, and other governmental establishments.

Mr. MAYS. And what, as you express it here, the soldier wants is an assurance that the military organization will not govern the administrative work of this project, of this bill.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, they want more assurance than that, sir.

Mr. GANDY. Let me put a question right there. I understand, then, in a nutshell, your idea is that just as much should be made definitely certain by legislation as possible, and as little left to the discretion of departmental officers as possible?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITE. Just one question there. I get it that you voice a fear in the mind of the soldier that this repugnant condition that you have described might be extended into the administration of this law? Is that it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir. Not only the military though—you are asking that particular question, question No. 5: "What insurance have we that in the work of improving and developing the land, a real merit system under which ability, application, and initiative shall be promoted to the highest degrees, and the evils of political and other forms of patronage minimized?" Now, that is the question.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You do not believe, Mr. Jeffries, do you, that there is any politics in the classified civil service? And all of these men in the Reclamation Service are appointed under civil service.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I believe that there is a great deal of politics in the classified civil service.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Not if the laws are properly administered.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I believe that there is a chance for a great deal of reform in the civil service before it is ideal, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jeffries, I don't know just what you mean by your contention that the merit system should prevail on one of these projects. Just explain what you have in mind.

Mr. JEFFRIES. It contemplates the employment of a great many soldiers, and you see I am an engineer, sir; I have been in charge of a great deal of work for a great many years, scattered over a considerable territory, and always when you start to accomplish a work, a considerable work, the first consideration is the securing of funds, the appropriation. Many times that is much more easily accomplished than the next very necessary step, which is the organizing of the forces, the organizing of the work. In the organization, if we haven't the very best of plans and regulations governing the organization of the forces, there is always liable to creep in a favoritism and the evils of political and other forms of patronage.

Mr. RAKER. Could you tell us right there how you would organize the forces as an engineer, for one of these projects, in your own way?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Sir, I would not attempt the organization alone.

Mr. RAKER. Well, how should it be organized?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It should be organized on the best established principles.

Mr. RAKER. What are those?

Mr. VAILE. Pardon me, judge, I think you are embarrassing the witness by asking him to state a general plan. He might state how he would make the organization, without attempting to give a general plan.

Mr. RAKER. He has in his head a general idea of how he would amend this bill or place it so that just what he is desiring would be carried out in the organizing of a force on one of these projects, say 100,000 acres in some States.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, to start with, sir, I will tell you that I would seek to have the bill so drawn that, as I try to bring out here: "Where the counsel, advice and desires of the settlers in matters affecting the policies of administration as to projects in which they are directly interested may be availed of."

I would make it as democratic as possible. If you have the time I will state that I have had some experience in matters which were carried to the people of a State, and that are of great similarity with this; that is, the highway construction proposition in the State of Wisconsin. And I will say there that we got appropriations ahead of a proper organization for the handling of the funds and that the highway commission and the department got in bad with the people to start with, because we didn't show the high degree of efficiency that might have been expected in the expenditure of these funds to start with; and so a rather different plan was taken and it was carried to all the different counties of the State, and there was a division of responsibility with each county, and then into districts, so that we took it right to the people and then we began to build up, and we have in the State of Wisconsin a magnificent system, very strong. Each winter we have a road school—the last two I have missed, unfortunately—I was across the water—but we have a road school which is attended by hundreds—six or seven hundred of the people who are interested in this work, and it has proven to our satisfaction that the democratic system of administering these public works is the only safe, sound, and efficient system, and so I would like to suggest—

Mr. GANDY (intreposing). You use that word in its broadest sense, and not in any political sense? (Laughter.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would like to suggest that this committee consider the proposition in case you pass this bill authorizing this appropriation, of an equitable distribution of the funds provided by the act, along the same lines as the distribution of the Federal aid highway fund. That is distributed to the different States, pro rated on a basis of three things: one-third determined by the proportion of post roads within the State, I believe; one-third according to the area, and one-third on population or valuation.

Mr. GANDY. On population.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And in that way the department, the United States Office of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture, is absolutely relieved of any responsibility in apportioning it, and they

are relieved of any suspicion as to favoritism in regard to the apportioning of these funds.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. Let me ask you a question. You spoke of the highway organization of Wisconsin being very efficient. Does politics enter into the organization in any way in the State of Wisconsin?

MR. JEFFRIES. Very little at the present time, sir.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. If they can keep politics out of the organization in Wisconsin, do you not think you could keep it out of the organization of the Reclamation Service?

MR. JEFFRIES. I think it is entirely possible, sir, especially in the present state of mind of the American people and the returning soldiers, because they desire very sincerely that this political patronage be absolutely minimized. They desire that very much above all else, I believe.

MR. TAYLOR. Sergeant, hasn't it been your observation that the Reclamation Service during the 17 years that it has been in existence it has not been charged with being controlled by political favoritism, has it?

MR. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

MR. TAYLOR. Either under Republican or Democratic administration. Hasn't it gone along very evenly?

MR. JEFFRIES. I think it has.

MR. TAYLOR. Don't you know that one reason why it is suggested that the Reclamation Service have charge of this is because of their experience in reclamation work and because they are not controlled and have not been controlled by politics? I don't think anybody knows the politics of anybody in there. I certainly do not, and I do not think there has been any—I haven't ever heard it charged in the Western States that politics cut any figure with the administration of the Reclamation Service, have you?

MR. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

MR. TAYLOR. Then why should they be suspicious about the Reclamation Service? We thought if there was any department or bureau in the whole Government that was conducted free from politics it was that bureau.

MR. JEFFRIES. I will agree with that.

MR. TAYLOR. Another thing, sergeant, you have thought over this thing a great deal and very deeply. Have you got any concrete suggestions to offer to the committee as to, in the first place, what we ought to do for the soldier? That is the great question, what should we do for them and how many of them, and that is what this committee wants to do, and then in what manner we should do it. Now, can you give us briefly and concisely your ideas about that in a constructive way—not in the way of criticism of what we have got here, but tell us what we ought to do. Can you do that quickly?

MR. JEFFRIES. I think I can.

MR. TAYLOR. Tell us in the first place what ought Uncle Sam or Congress to do for the soldier; secondly, how we should do it?

MR. JEFFRIES. I think that a great deal can be done by the enactment of this law with some beneficial changes and additions. A great deal can be done.

MR. TAYLOR. Can you suggest the changes?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just give them to us for our constructive aid. That is what we want.

Mr. JEFFRIES. To start with, this proposition of equitable distribution—

Mr. VAILE (interposing). Take the bill, sergeant, and show us just where you would amend it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, he can hardly go through the bill. Just give us your general ideas.

Mr. JEFFRIES. The matter of equitable distribution is of first importance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, why? In what way?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Along the same lines.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you give them all cash?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, I don't care to go into the proposition of a bonus to the soldiers before this Public Lands Committee, unless you wish it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, do you believe in giving them a bonus straight out?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Do I?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. TAYLOR. You think they ought to all have a bonus?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. In cash?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. \$5,000 apiece?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what way?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Is that germane to this question?

The CHAIRMAN. You may answer the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, if you can, because we want to know.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, I will say this is my personal opinion. I think that almost universally the enlisted men made a sacrifice, made a considerable sacrifice, a financial sacrifice, as well as other sacrifices in the service, and that every man who left his home and left his business and left his ordinary vocation, and went into a camp and then returned again, that he lost financially out of proportion to the men who did not see service. So I think that the Government of the United States does owe—I don't think that \$30 was sufficient pay, and I don't think the emoluments were sufficient, and then along that line I would say this, that it is my idea that a just settlement with the soldier would be based on two things; that is, that every man who volunteered or was inducted—and I should say that the volunteers should have somewhere near an even break anyway in this—into the service, that they should be allowed by this Government, in addition to their regular pay which was provided, a fixed sum to cover the amount which might be considered as being still due them, as of justice, for the time they lost and the losses they sustained going into the service and coming out—a fixed sum to cover that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would you give them that in cash?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just turn it over to them and let them blow it in.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; let them blow it in; let them waste it. Yes, sir; let them blow it in for anything they want to. My God, we went all through the war with somebody telling us what we could do and what we could not do. Those men went through the war and fought this fight to win it, and they won it; and they are capable—just as capable as some of the rest of you men of deciding what to do with those few dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much cash would you say to give each one of them?

Mr. JEFFRIES. If I had the say so, I would give each one of them \$150, every man of them, and then I would say a bonus of about 75 cents, six bits, for every day which he served in the Army. I think that would be just and equitable. The man who served 18 months suffered a greater loss, made a greater contribution in a financial way. And now, I do not think the financial contribution should be required from those soldiers. I think their debt of patriotism, and so forth, was paid by the dangerous and disagreeable service which they rendered; but they nearly all came back broke.

Mr. TAYLOR. Don't you think if we save them all that in money that four out of five of them would have it all expended in some way in 30 days' or 90 days' time?

Mr. JEFFRIES. A lot of them would, before that.

Mr. TAYLOR. And then do you think that should cancel the obligation of the Government to help those boys get a home of some sort?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir; I do not think that it should ever cancel that.

Mr. TAYLOR. But they should be allowed to do whatever they pleased from that time on?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, leave it to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. To do whatever they please?

Mr. JEFFRIES. If you leave this to them, and they get this money, they will make a great deal better use of it than if you folks start in to tell them what they can do and what they can not do. That can not be done with the kind of men who went and upset the greatest military system on earth. It don't work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Our boys are very similar in characteristics to the Canadian boys, and has not the Canadian Government provided for the loaning of money to help the Canadian boys to help themselves, rather than turning over the cash without any string on it? And don't you think that will operate to build up homes and families, better than giving the money to them outright to spend?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Sir, I have more confidence in these buck soldiers than maybe you have. I have explicit confidence in them. A few here and there will waste some money, but I venture to say some of you here waste money, too. There is a free American privilege that we value very, very, highly, the privilege of spending a nickel, a dime, or a dollar as we damn please. And as far as that paying the debt entirely, I do not figure that if you pass this bill, or pass it in the most efficient, most effective manner that will bring the most benefit to the men, a lot of them that wish to avail themselves of this, I do not think that will be in the shape of a bonus. It is simply a loan, isn't it? It is all to be paid back? Outside of that, I think

this country owes a debt to each individual soldier, bar none. I do not think they paid him anywhere near in proportion to what others were paid. I know they did not. I was drawing \$3,600 a year myself, and I enlisted for \$30 a month. But that is all right. I have one lung left and I have probably 20 or 30 years to live. I am nearly 40 now. I can get by; nearly all of us can. God, if we could get through what existed over there, we can here. We do not ask for anything except to break even, for a square deal. We do not ask for \$10 a day as the fellows got that loafed on the jobs; but it would create a much better feeling with the soldiers if they got something without a string on it.

Mr. TAYLOR. You think we ought to just scrap this bill here, then, and just make a straight donation in cash and call it quits?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Don't you honestly believe that a big majority of them would make wise use of that money?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I certainly do. God, I saw them make wise use of the few pennies and the few francs they had. They made wise use of that.

Mr. FERRIS. Sergeant, would a \$1,000 flat, given to every soldier who would use that as a part purchase for a home, either city, urban, or farm, and let him work out the balance in his own way, let him select his home, let him make application to the Government to buy it for him, and make the initial payment of at least \$1,000, how would that suit the soldier? Don't you think he would be satisfied with that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir. There are so many strings, and there are many soldiers, sir, who do not want to buy a home right now. We do not want to be fastened down, a lot of us; we want to look around a little. We have not seen this United States at all, and we might want to spend a little of this bonus money for car fare.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask you another question: For such of them who did want to buy a home, would you think that would be all right?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think that would be fine.

Mr. FERRIS. That would let them select their own homes, but let the Government make the initial payment?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And give the soldier a chance to work out the balance?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. For such of them as wanted to buy a home, you think that would be satisfactory?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; but I doubt if that would be the very best plan. I think it would be a very good plan, but I doubt if it would be the best plan.

Mr. FERRIS. For such soldiers that did not desire to enter into this soldier-colony plan contemplated by this bill, what would you think about letting him select a home in a community in which he desires to live, and make him a straight-out loan through the Federal Farm Loan Bank sufficient to buy that home and let him pay it back at a low rate of interest over a period of 40 years?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think that can be incorporated in this bill; that option. I think that would give—you see I lost a lot of the words I

had when I went over, and I got a lot of new ones that are not appropriate, but that would give to the proposition an internal competition which is very necessary; that is, projects could be attempted and carried through within the States, and then in competition with that would be the proposition of the individual's selection. That would be very fine competition.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me ask you this question, then. I do not think we are so far apart. You can conceive, from the knowledge you have of the West, where pretty nearly this exact plan would be applicable in those 12 or 15 Western States with public land available.

Mr. JEFFRIES. As it is right now?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, subject to modifications.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, couldn't we as a practical proposition—I am asking this solely for information for myself and the benefit of the committee; I think we have a lot in common with these soldiers in this line, and we are trying to get their viewpoint—couldn't the good features in this bill be preserved, with such modifications and changes as would make it acceptable to the States where it is feasible, and then couldn't we insert an alternative proposition in this legislation, along the line I have suggested, and allow them to make individual applications for loans to buy individual tracts in States where they want to locate? Wouldn't that be more satisfactory to the soldiers, and would not reach a larger number?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely. I think this distribution could be provided by the act so that a certain amount is available for each State—I think that is very important—and a fixed amount, so that the Secretary of the Interior is not subject to criticism for the manner of distribution. Then I think the bill should require that a department be created, or some department already in existence, within the State to be charged with the responsibility of administering this fund within the State under the supervision and in cooperation with the Federal department—with the Department of Interior. I think that is entirely practicable, and that that would bring it much closer to the people. And then include the two plans, the plan of the project and always the opportunity of individual selection. I want to say that that thing is more important to the soldiers, much more so than it ever was before—this proposition of making individual selections and using your own judgment.

It is very repugnant to the soldier to think of being forcibly required to go in a cantonment or a project—and that is the way it looks to them, where he is hedged in here like this: This is No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4, and maybe a little later on, when children are born, they will put an aluminum dog tag on their necks, and that is their number. And I have heard this ventured many times. And then they will build a certain kind of church on that project, and you don't have any chance to fuss around like you fellows here do, and enjoy that, and out of it comes great good. But we have no chance to fuss about what kind of a church, what kind of a school, or what kind of a seminary we thought ought to be provided. There are a lot of fellows that want to shift that responsibility. We let this department that is all wise over here furnish us plans over there and the

plans did not fit at all; they absolutely did not fit at all. Every time we got those plans and had to operate under them it was suicide, and we always dodged those plans. And so we are afraid of this little model community, but while we would like to have them built we would like to look over the plans and see if they are all right. But over there we were not allowed to pick out the mud-hole in which to lie down, but we were lined up in the Argonne, company front, and we would strike shell holes as big as this little table, and we were supposed to pitch our tents in a straight line on the company front. We would rather have picked a place a little out of the water, if possible. And so that is very important right now that maybe you do trust a little bit to the soldiers. Suppose a few of them do spend this money? It does not go out of existence. Somebody else will get it. They do not burn it up lighting cigarettes, and they will get a little experience in that way and they are satisfied. And that is the main thing.

Mr. WHITE. And, by the same token, you would trust a little bit, then, the thousands and tens of thousands of soldier boys who have had experience in practical farming that want to make individual selections themselves?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would say that they would use the very best judgment, equivalent to that of any bunch of men that I have ever seen. I am at ease in addressing you men. You men are of very high caliber, I recognize; but when I talk to the doughboys, who have pondered deeply on these subjects and have gone right down to bed-rock, I feel the necessity of making my supreme effort to interest them and hold their attention; they are so keen, and so smart; they do not have to have somebody to look out for them, look after their quarters, you know, for fear they will waste them, and there will be this dissatisfaction as long as Congress and the people of this country take that attitude.

Mr. NICHOLS. In connection with your statement as to a soldier being allowed to do as he chose in this matter, I will call your attention to this language, to a sentence in this bill: The Secretary shall make regulations, general in character or applicable to the specific projects, as to the residence and cultivation, with a view to carrying out the purpose of making the soldier settlements the permanent homes of the soldier purchaser. What do you think of that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think that is all right as applied to the project. The project is the community idea, and certain ideas must be observed and carried out whereby cooperation can be compelled. But I think there should be the option always, so that a man—for instance, in the Army, you know, there was no option; you see, you had no choice. Only the officers had an option. You know that when you went up to the front, the enlisted man had no option; they went where they were told. But there were a lot of options among the officers, little things that would happen, you know; and that was fine for them, and most of them are a lot better satisfied than the enlisted men. And in this I can conceive of the necessity for great supervisory powers in order to make successful these projects. I think it has been necessary in the reclamation projects, because if they allow of certain internal troubles and strikes, you know, and differences of opinion, etc., it might defeat the purpose of the entire

project. And there would be no objection to that if the man were a free agent in choosing between a piece of land in a project and a piece of land which he selected elsewhere.

Now, I will say another thing, that when the man himself goes and makes a selection, he has done the thing that the Americans only, I believe, did over there—he has challenged the world on that proposition, you see; he is bound by his choice either to make that succeed or to show that he was wrong, and he has an especial interest and an especial responsibility in the proposition which he himself selects. But that is not the case in regard to projects to any considerable degree, because the project at the best is controlled by a group and not by individuals, and it is easy to pass the buck to shift the responsibility. And we have seen that done.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Jeffries, you spoke a while ago about the payment of \$150 as a bonus and the sum of 75 cents per day while they were in the service.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you mean that to be in lieu of any land plan?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Why, absolutely not. I think that much money, at least that much money in cash, is due these soldiers.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think they would be satisfied with that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. A great many would be. Now, you men are Members of Congress, and I will tell you what I believe——

Mr. SMITH. Do you think the officers should be included?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I hold no brief for the officers. They had many, many privileges that the enlisted man did not have.

Mr. SMITH. Is it not true, Mr. Jeffries, that a great many officers went in the service, and some remained only a few months before the armistice was signed and some only a few weeks, and they spent four, five, or six hundred dollars for uniforms, and the folks back home had to help them to pay for them?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I believe that.

Mr. SMITH. And that many officers in civil life made a great financial sacrifice, as great as many of the privates?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Of course, in that case it was different; but a great many of the officers were war profiteers—a great many.

Mr. SMITH. I think that may be true.

Mr. JEFFRIES. But the enlisted men did not; they were no war profiteers.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, what percentage of the men would avail themselves of the farm plan?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It would depend very materially on the confidence that is inspired in the men in the practicability and its freedom from these objections. I think there would be a great many.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be your idea of the percentage of those that would avail themselves, assuming the plan was a good plan?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am not in a position to fix a percentage.

The CHAIRMAN. Very roughly; just approximately.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would say that out of the A. E. F. that there would be 100,000 men at least.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred thousand?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; from the 2,000,000 that were overseas.

The CHAIRMAN. No more than 100,000?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I say at the least.

The CHAIRMAN. At the least?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say 100,000 or 200,000?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I said 100,000 of the 2,000,000 that were overseas. I think, at the very least, there would be that many who would feel the necessity and the desire both; yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Jeffries, have they become conversant with this bill over there through any agency over there? Has anyone sought to explain to them what this land bill was over there, and how generally do they know about it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. A great many have explained, but they know less about it after it has been explained than they do if it has not been explained.

Mr. FERRIS. What percentage of the men over there had any idea, do you think, what this bill really provided for?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No percentage at all.

Maj. BRADY. I do not believe officially the men know anything about it at all. The only way I got any information was from the Paris-New York Herald, and I showed that to a lot of my own men.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I will say this, that they have been very keenly interested, and what they have asked about more than anything else was of the free homestead land and any preferential right as to entry under the existing laws that soldiers would have. A great many have turned their attention toward the Western States, and, from various sources, they have just conceived the idea that Congress would undoubtedly give a preferential right to ex-soldiers. Now, as regards this Lane plan, this plan of creating a new thing entirely, their information is very, very incomplete. And I will say, as I said at first, that the general—well, I have lost my vocabulary; I know what I want to say—that the inclination is to view it with doubt. And the general statements that will be made among the men are that it will provide a bunch of good jobs for fellows that see them first and are close up to the throne, and the like of that. That is very, very common conversation. And there is that fear and suspicion among the enlisted men.

Mr. MAYS. Are you giving now your suspicions or the suspicions of the Army men generally?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I have stated that this is common conversation among the men.

Mr. MAYS. You have had opportunities to consult with vast numbers of soldiers on this?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I have, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And you have taken advantage of that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes, sir. I did not smoke any cigarettes while I was over there; I was busy many hundreds of extra hours, writing for the regiment, and I wrote to the States here, and I have for many years always been seeking diligently to find out what people think.

Mr. MAYS. And you have explained this bill to a great number, this plan?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, no.

Mr. MAYS. I thought you said you had.

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir. I did not have any complete knowledge of this until I came back here and went to the Secretary's office to get some circulars and books, and so forth.

Mr. MAYS. When you gave the 10 questions that occurred to the soldiers, then, you were giving the questions that occurred to you rather than to the soldiers?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; questions that have been brought up many times in talking to the soldiers themselves.

Mr. MAYS. I thought you did not talk to them about this bill?

Mr. JEFFRIES. You asked if I explained this particular bill.

Mr. MAYS. Oh, you explained the plan?

Mr. SNELL. You were talking about the general legislation?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I was talking about the general legislation; yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And you find the men strongly in favor of some general legislation of this character?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. They believe they ought to have opportunities of this sort, and some bill that would afford it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And your objections to the bill go more to the details and administrative features and possibilities of abuse?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH. Of course we all recognize that it would be impossible to compensate these soldiers to the full extent for the sacrifices they have made; but have you estimated about how much it would cost to follow out the plan you suggest? For instance, \$150 bonus, and then 75 cents a day for each day they served, assuming on the average they served about a year, and taking the 4,000,000 in the service.

Mr. JEFFRIES. If they do not get this million out faster than they have been doing it is going to run the average up, too.

Mr. SMITH. Taking it on the average, that would be about \$515 apiece for each of the 4,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. That would be about \$2,000,000,000?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. That, Mr. Jeffries, would take care of all the soldiers?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; I think it should be very equal to all to participate.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not to be in lieu of the land clause?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. NICHOLS. You know this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$500,000,000, and that it has been stated before the committee here that it would not, probably, provide for any more than 100,000 of the whole Army and Navy. Your idea is, I take it, that something should be done by Congress in an equitable way, as you say, so that every soldier, irrespective of whether he desired to go on a farm or do something else, should be aided by the Government?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes; absolutely.

Mr. VAILE. Just one question, sergeant: Would you regard the fact that different kinds of land is contemplated in this bill an objection to the plan?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. VAILE. Your experience with the Reclamation Service would lead you to believe that that was an advantage rather than a disadvantage, wouldn't it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir. I would consider that the present reclamation proposition, the present Reclamation Service is probably able and is progressing along the lines of taking care of great disproportionate areas of land in the West, and the Western States as it now stands, and that an equitable distribution, what I would call an equitable distribution to the States, would probably be based on the number of soldiers (because they say it is primarily for the soldiers) that each State furnished. Now, then, in the State in which I live now, Wisconsin, and the State in which I lived for 25 years, South Dakota, they have a greater area or proportion of land which would be reclaimed undoubtedly than some of the other States. The Reclamation Service is working in those States on that, and that does not need to be included in this. This bill does not need to be framed for the purpose of supplanting the proposition of reclaiming tracts of land in the West, which can continue on its own merits.

Mr. VAILE. And while you would like to go and select lands there in Wisconsin if you saw fit, on the other hand you would not like to be tied down to selecting land only in Wisconsin?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. BENHAM. What, in your judgment, would be the attitude of the rank and file of the soldier toward the project, of having the Government make the improvements as this bill presupposes, inasmuch as the soldier is to be called upon finally to pay the bills? What would be the attitude of the rank and file of the soldiers toward having those improvements made by the Government?

Mr. JEFFRIES. In the matter of projects, I think the rank and file would consider that a necessity.

Mr. BENHAM. I did not mean that. But take the farm that is to be turned over to the soldier, do you think he would prefer himself to do the improving, or have the Government do it for him; that is, inasmuch as he has to pay the bills in either case?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I surely think that in the majority of cases the soldier would prefer to do his own improving in his own way, on his own time, and to secure financial aid.

Mr. VAILE. Do you make any distinction between different stages of improvement? Do you think that it would be advisable for the Government to first put the project in shape for cultivation, and then let the soldier on his own means and on his own time, proceed with the cultivation and further improvement as he sees fit? Or do you think the soldier should undertake individually to put the land in its first original shape for cultivation?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Of course, that is going into details. I think that should be governed through these boards which are established in the various States and in cooperation with the department. For instance, there are many different classes of crops; some land might be fruit land.

Mr. VAILE. You think, as I get your viewpoint, that it would be wise, and in many cases necessary, for the initial putting of the land in shape to be done by the Government, or by the State and National Government together?

Mr. JEFFRIES. In projects, absolutely; yes, sir. And I would like to say that if the impression were given out that if this land bill would be in lieu of any settlement, any bonus to the soldiers as a whole, that this land bill would be very, very unpopular. Now, I can tell you that; there is no question about that, no matter what anyone hears.

Mr. MAYS. Most of them want the coin?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely they do.

Mr. TAYLOR. You take it the soldiers are not satisfied with the \$60?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir; absolutely not. That is pay for six days' work in the shipyards, whether they work or not.

Just before I enlisted, a very close friend of mine, Henry Dietz, who is a brother of the Dietz of Cameron Dam fame—and I liked that man—who has several big sons who had been in the Army: his father came from Germany, but he is a big, strong American—he came to me and he said, "Hugh, I try to see this thing fairly, but it looks to me as if this is a fight between England and Germany," and he says, "now, it is going to cost this country"—and he went on to tell how much it would cost, how much it had cost already, and how much it was going to cost. I said, "Dietz, honestly that doesn't interest me; I don't care a damn what it is going to cost: it may cost me my life, but I am going to go, and so this business of how many millions and billions it is going to cost doesn't make any difference, because if it did we would not be fit to live in this kind of a country." And so we went over there, and we did not count the cost. You did not count the cost when you were buying the other things—the cannon, the tools, and labor here—you did not count the cost. And since I have returned here the Secretary of the Treasury has published a statement in all of the daily papers, over his signature, in which he said there were still 1,500,000 soldiers overseas, and that the people should buy Victory bonds to get them home. They bought the bonds. That was \$4,500,000,000. Now, really, we are not masters of mathematics; we are just engineers, and farmers, and like of that, but it appears to us that about \$100,000,000 would have brought the soldiers home all right, first class, each one traveling on his own hook. One hundred million; and there was \$4,500,000,000 raised under this appeal to the country, and so we are not so dense as not to see that. And then the next day the Secretary of War published an interview in all the papers in which he is quoted as having said that the one-millionth man would embark for home the next week. Now, there were only 1,950,000 over there when the armistice was signed. The Secretary of the Treasury says 1,500,000 are over there yet, and the Secretary of War says the millionth man will embark next week. There is a wide disparagement of statements. But even if it did take \$4,500,000,000 to bring those men home, the people of this country would willingly pay that \$4,500,000,000, and honestly the soldiers are going to help to pay all of this.

Mr. MAYS. Wasn't there some use for that money other than for transportation?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh; yes; presumably.

Mr. RAKER. Just when did you get back from France?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The 22d of March I landed in Philadelphia.

Mr. RAKER. You were over there how long?

Mr. JEFFRIES. A year, lacking eight days.

Mr. RAKER. You were over there at the Argonne Forest?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I was in the Argonne Forest.

Mr. RAKER. And in Balleau Woods?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I was not in Balleau Woods; I was back of Balleau Woods.

Mr. RAKER. And your business is engineering?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. What have you been doing since you came back?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Since I came back?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, I have answered a very close lot of questions about what I have been doing.

Mr. RAKER. I mean since you have been discharged. This is just so the committee will have an idea of what you have been doing.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I was discharged on the 4th of April at Camp Dix. I came here to Washington to confer with the Acting Director of the United States Office of Public Roads in regard to employment. I was on the eligible list of the civil service as a highway engineer, United States Office of Public Roads. But my lungs have been affected by some gas I got in the Argonne, and I thought I would have to go out in the mountains for a few months, and I made arrangements to go to work out there from the Denver office, on highway construction in the national forests. And then I went to my home at Danbury, Wis., and got acquainted with my family—I have a wife and four children—and I had promised all of the men of my company, most of the men in the battalion over in France, when I left them, that immediately upon arriving home, if the regiment was not yet home, that I would come to Washington and do everything in my power to secure the release of my fellow camp mate, John F. Hinkley, who was court-martialed over on the Lorraine front, and who had a wife and five children absolutely dependent on the allowance and the allotment which this wife and children were to get from the Government. On the morning of the 4th of July over there we had placed a big barrage on the German line, and we were on the front from 3 o'clock in the morning, and we stood by all day, so it made a long day of it, and on the morning of the 5th of July this man had asked the captain of the company for a pass to go to a detachment nearby—we had four detachments covering the entire front of that division—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know that we want to go into the merits of that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. The only thing I wanted to see, Mr. Jeffries, is if you are in the employee of the Government now?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am not.

Mr. RAKER. Would not the Road Administration employ you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; they would.

Mr. RAKER. And didn't you go into the service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. RAKER. What are you doing now, just in a few words?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am president of this American Military Reform Association.

Mr. TAYLOR. When was that organized?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I can not give you the exact date. It was just a short time ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where are its headquarters?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do they pay the officers a salary?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much do you get out of it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, I get \$7,500 a year.

Mr. MAYS. What are the purposes of that organization?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Do you wish to put them in the record? They are in the Congressional Record.

Mr. MAYS. They are already?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. This is to reform the military organization?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is to secure some reforms.

Mr. RAKER. And who is paying for this organization, the boys themselves?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, just in a few words, it is not really applicable to this—

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am very glad to have you bring it out, sir.

Mr. RAKER. There is a general feeling of the private soldier—there is quite a feeling of the private soldier, against the officers generally, is there not?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And that exists with practically all of the boys as against generally all of the officers?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; practically.

Mr. RAKER. Because of the rules and regulations?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The caste system does not fit.

Mr. RAKER. What is that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The cast system does not fit; it does not work out.

Mr. RAKER. It does not fit the American man?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. RAKER. I do not want to go any further into that now; I want to go on the bill; who were the other officers of the organization, beside yourself? You are president, you say.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And who is the vice president?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The vice president has not yet been selected.

Mr. RAKER. And have you a counsel?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; an executive committee.

Mr. RAKER. Give the counsel's name, will you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. You mean legal counsel?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; Frank Warrick.

Mr. RAKER. Where does he live?

Mr. JEFFRIES. In Washington, I believe, but I am not sure.

Mr. RAKER. Was he in the service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. He is just a lawyer and did not go in the service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And he is acting as counsel now of this organization?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; we have an assistant counsel, too.

Mr. RAKER. What is his name?

Mr. JEFFRIES. David Pelton Moore.

Mr. RAKER. What is his position? He did not go in the service either, did he?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And what salary do you pay those two men?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The salary has not been fixed.

Mr. RAKER. How many constitute the executive committee?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Three.

Mr. RAKER. Who are they?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Myself, George Grojean——

Mr. RAKER. And the other man's name?

Mr. JEFFRIES. John F. Giles.

Mr. RAKER. Were the latter two in the service?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Are they here in Washington?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. If you hold that job some time, you will make up what you lost financially in the service, won't you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I might; yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. You will probably earn all of your salary before you get through?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; we have to to get it.

Mr. RAKER. When was this organization formed?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I haven't the date.

Mr. RAKER. Approximately. Just give approximately the date.

Mr. TAYLOR. A month or three months ago?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, no; I said about 10 days ago. It was sometime about the 12th of June that the legal organization was effected.

Mr. RAKER. Where did you organize; here in Washington?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. At what place?

Mr. JEFFRIES. You mean where the articles were signed?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; in what room, what building, was it that you got together?

Mr. JEFFRIES. In the McLaughlin Building.

Mr. RAKER. About how many were present?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I can not say.

Mr. RAKER. How many soldiers that were overseas in the combative service participated in this organization?

Mr. JEFFRIES. How many soldiers participated in the signing of the papers?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; at that meeting when you organized?

Mr. JEFFRIES. This man, John F. Giles, and myself were the only ones that were in the fighting over there.

Mr. RAKER. How many were present at the meeting outside of those; how many other men were present?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I can not say. There were not very many.

Mr. RAKER. These two lawyers were present?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Just one of them.

Mr. RAKER. Did you have any meeting prior to this time?

Mr. JEFFRIES. We had conferences; yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You just had conferences prior to this time?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And this meeting was a confirmation of that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; yes, sir. We had many conferences on the drawing up of the articles.

Mr. RAKER. You have articles of agreement and incorporation, have you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, it is articles of association.

Mr. RAKER. Will you furnish a copy of those to the chairman, so that they may go into the record?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, I can not right now.

Mr. RAKER. I mean, will you to-morrow or next day?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I can not say that I would. No; I have a right, of course——

Mr. RAKER. What method have you adopted to raise your salary—to assess each of the boys so much?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is a membership proposition.

Mr. RAKER. It is a membership proposition, and your purpose is to go out and get all the boys to join the association you can?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Not only soldiers, but citizens.

Mr. RAKER. And you will pay the officers so much?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir. And we are going to publish a magazine, too.

Mr. MAYS. And will you take in sailors also?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. About how many signed the papers of organization?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Just the three of us.

Mr. RAKER. Just the three of you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And then you fixed your salary at \$7,500?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And the idea now is to extend the organization by writing to these soldiers, to get their names and write to them, asking them to join and setting out the purpose of the organization is to remedy and correct the military laws, and then expect them to pay a certain percentage or a fee each year to belong to the membership?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir. And not only the soldiers, sir, but citizens.

Mr. RAKER. I understand; this organization not only includes soldiers, but everybody else who wants to join?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. But the main purpose is to get soldiers to join, because they are interested in it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, the main purpose is to get those who believe in the purposes, as set forth very clearly, to join—citizens and soldiers.

Mr. RAKER. Were there as many as 10 present when this was organized?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I doubt it.

Mr. RAKER. Between 5 and 10; somewhere along there?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. About how many members have you now, sergeant?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I do not know.

Mr. RAKER. You have not any members signed up yet except those who were present, have you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes.

Mr. RAKER. How did you get them?

Mr. JEFFRIES. You know that is something peculiarly our business and not germane to this.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment now——

Mr. JEFFRIES. Honestly, now, that is not good business.

Mr. RAKER. Sure; you know, Mr. Jeffries, we do not want anything but what is germane and vital to this question.

Mr. JEFFRIES. For your information, you know—for your curiosity, you know, that might be all right.

Mr. RAKER. My curiosity is very extensive, but it is valuable.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; we have other members. It is not restricted to enlisted men; we have officers.

Mr. RAKER. How did you get these other men?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Why, different means; some of them through the mail.

Mr. RAKER. Have they signed up?

Mr. JEFFRIES. They have paid their money.

Mr. RAKER. About how many?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I do not want to state. That is like asking a publisher to turn over his subscription list to you and everything; that is not done.

Mr. RAKER. If a publisher came in here indorsing any matter before the committee I would certainly insist on knowing who his subscribers were.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am not asking for anything from this committee—any patronage or anything.

Mr. RAKER. We haven't any patronage to give.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I am not asking you to sign up for any advertising in the magazine or anything of that kind.

Mr. RAKER. You are going to publish a magazine?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; yes, sir. And I am to be editor in chief of the magazine, too.

Mr. RAKER. Well, it ought to be a good one.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir; we hope so. We will try to make it a good one; we certainly will.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Witness, to get down to the bill: You are in favor of the general purposes of the legislation?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. But now there are criticisms of some things you would like to have changed, namely, you do not want any department to direct and control the personal affairs of the men, the mode of living, the mode of cultivation; the way he builds his home, the way he builds his house, and the way he lives; you want to leave that to the individual?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I want to leave that to group decisions and to the individual.

Mr. RAKER. To the individual men, exactly?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is, as much as possible to the individual, and then to group decisions and State boards.

Mr. RAKER. And wherever that is in the bill, your idea is it ought to be stricken out?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And where there is any policy, before a project is started, before the Secretary acts, or any public official, the advice and judgment of those who were on the project, or who were interested in it, should control and not the Secretary of anybody else? That is your view, isn't it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think their counsel and advice should be availed of.

Mr. RAKER. And before any action is taken that advice and counsel should be had?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Otherwise, you do not believe it would work well?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I do not believe it would work best without it.

Mr. RAKER. You are in favor of having each soldier treated alike on the projects?

Mr. JEFFRIES. As nearly as can be.

Mr. RAKER. You are against giving any preference to one over the other?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You do not believe the farmer boy should have any preference over the blacksmith boy, or the dentist or the doctor, or whatever he might be, who went into the service; is that right? You do not believe he should have any preference in getting a home on these projects?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think it should be open to all on the same terms; yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And that if a soldier should happen to have a little residence in town, and there is a project started some place in the Southeast, in the West, or in the North, that he ought to have a chance to go out there and get his home as well, too; oughtn't he?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You think to exclude him would not be right, because he owns a little tract of land, a little home in some city, of very little value; that he has given his service, and if he wants to go out on one of these projects, he ought to have a right to do it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would like to make a little statement along that line, if you care to have it.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I take issue with the Secretary of the Interior on that one proposition. In one of his published statements he said there should be no slacker land and these tracts should be restricted to a size which will just merely support one family, and there should be no chance of unearned increment. Now, then, I say why be so particular to see that the soldier gets no chance to profit by unearned increment, when there is an opportunity that is afforded to everybody else? For instance, in the State of Wisconsin, where I have lived now for four years—for six years counting the time my home has been there, but my abode somewhere else—men very commonly buy 80 acres of rough land where they do not expect in their lifetime to develop more than 40 acres; but when that 40 acres is developed, then it increases the value of the other 40 acres—it has doubled, trebled, or quadrupled it. And as a rule, I think that the strong families are bred and born and raised on those tracts, and that it is a fine thing for the man. This is a long-time bet that these soldiers are taking when they take this, and I think that opportunity should

be afforded them to take more land—double the amount of land, probably, that they themselves can be expected to cultivate within the next few years, at least, and give them a chance to benefit by the unearned increment, which they earn.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Jeffries, I have put this question many times to the various witnesses before this committee during this hearing, and I am going to put it to you and get your judgment on it: Are you in favor of a project so developed as to get the roads and to have the water for it, with just enough land cleared so that the soldier may go upon the place with a little home, a small house and sufficient outbuildings, and leave the rest of his tract of land—suppose he had 100 acres, to leave 80 acres for him to clear and to handle and to add other buildings if he wants to, other barns—do you think it would be better for him to live in that way, or to clear it all up at once?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I believe the way which you have outlined is the better way.

Mr. RAKER. It will give him a better chance?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It will give him a better chance, absolutely.

Mr. RAKER. It will give him a chance to work for himself and family?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I believe that.

Mr. RAKER. And give him a chance to get the benefit of his own labor when there are slack times, between harvest and other times of the year?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You believe that will be better than to have the entire tract developed with roads, and all under cultivation, and all cleared?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely. I think that would allow the settler to apply and develop his individual initiative and ability to the highest degree; and that is certainly to be desired.

Mr. RAKER. One other question in regard to section 4. I have pressed this to various witnesses and I am going to put it to you because you have had experience. You have been in France and observed their mode of living, their towns?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Their communiques?

Mr. RAKER. And then doing all the work from town, farming the farms from the city. Are you in favor of that kind of living in this country?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir; I believe in homes on the land.

Mr. RAKER. Separate, individual homes?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Like we have here in America. The worst we have in any of these rural districts is far superior to the best they have in the communes in France.

Mr. RAKER. We do not want any communist centers—centers where you put all the population at one place and then let them farm their farms from where they live, do you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. RAKER. Then that provision, section 4, that the Department of the Interior should have a right to select town sites, to establish them, and to build up a regular little town. You do not believe it would be possible, do you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. If that does not include a requirement as to residence and participation in all those activities, I think that the policy

that has been pursued in this country on public land and on private land, of dedicating for school, religious, and recreational purposes certain tracts of ground that are decided, by those in a position to make a wise decision, to be peculiarly adapted to the center—

Mr. RAKER. In other words, set aside a tract of land for a park, a schoolhouse, or for other purposes?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And then let the people themselves select the kind of church they want to build?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And the kind of schoolhouse they want to build?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You do not want any committee, commission or individual in Washington or anywhere else, going out there on one of those projects and telling you what kind of church you want and the kind of schoolhouse you want, do you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You think it will create trouble, don't you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. Sergeant, on a settlement of that kind, would you have any objection, if a dozen plans were laid before you and you had the privilege of selecting the one that suited you and your community best, and by means of this plan you could purchase the material at wholesale prices—you would not object to that arrangement?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. SUMMERS. That is what the bill contemplates.

Mr. JEFFRIES. The bill?

Mr. SUMMERS. Yes; that is what the bill contemplates.

Mr. JEFFRIES. There is no objection that I can conceive of. This proposition of counsel, advice, suggestion, and plans, that is in line with the best educational efforts, and suggestions, and that is very fine. But the choice should be a majority choice; that is the American way.

Mr. SUMMERS. But it brings it to the man at a very much less price than he could handle it privately, without the assistance?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is quite possible.

Mr. BENHAM. Would you assume that the boys would be better satisfied with an advisor that they selected, or one that was selected by the Interior Department?

Mr. JEFFRIES. To what advisor do you refer?

Mr. BENHAM. The advisor, etc., that is suggested in the former question; that is, an agricultural advisor, of this gentleman who is in charge of the project, who is to act as advisor, etc. Now, my question is, do you assume that the boys would be best satisfied with an advisor selected by themselves, or one selected by the Interior Department?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Of course, I think the safest policy and the best policy is the one that puts the responsibility on the people themselves; and I think that the soldiers and other people have a little more confidence in their State boards; that is, they feel closer to the State representatives than to the Federal representatives. I think the soldiers have a great deal more confidence in Congress than they have in any of the departments; I will say that. That is the reason

we ask, after Congress has appropriated the money under provisions of this act, what supervisory powers it has over those expenditures. Now, then, we have found during the progress of this war that is about the only place we could get any kind of a hearing for the enlisted man—through Congress, through Congressmen. And when we came back, that is the only place we could go and get a hearing—a respectful hearing.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are 435 of us here who have been working for you every day and night since you went into the Army—every last one of us.

Mr. JEFFRIES. We believe you have been working for us; we believe Congress has the sincere desire, in the establishment of the war risk, to protect the soldiers to the best of their ability. We believe the desire of Congress was absolutely for the best interests of the soldiers in that.

Mr. RAKER. What is your view, after the soldier has resided upon the place, say, for from three to five years, of his having the right to dispose of it at his own will, provided the Government is protected?

Mr. JEFFRIES. We believe that he should be protected in his equities; that he should not be arbitrarily restrained from realizing on his equity—that he should not be arbitrarily forced to remain where he does not care to be.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, that his right of alienation should not be given except within a reasonable length of time of acquiring residence?

Mr. JEFFRIES. We think, if possible, that the restriction against transfer should be stated in the law.

Mr. RAKER. Exactly.

Mr. JEFFRIES. And not left to the discretion of this man who happens to be now Secretary of the Interior, or somebody else who happens later to be Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. RAKER. And a definite period should be fixed?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. What would you say in regard to a provision in the bill that where the soldier does take the homestead and the cost against it has not been paid, of there remaining a lien upon the land in favor of the Government until it is paid: You think that would be fair, don't you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Perfectly just.

Mr. RAKER. Perfectly fair?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You are familiar with the present homestead law in regard to it not being subject to any debt contracted by the homesteader prior to the issuance of the patent: What is your view as to whether or not such a provision should be included in this bill to protect the soldier from any debts contracted prior to the date of the issuance of the patent by the Government?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I should think he should have the same protection.

Mr. RAKER. Exactly.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And what have you to say in regard to his physically and actually residing upon the land a certain length of time, like upon the present homesteads?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Well, sir, I think that there is a case where it should be elastic, where it should be left to the decision of a group—say, the State board and the settlers, because the conditions are so much different. For instance, in the Northern States there will be a period of many, many months in which you can do nothing.

Mr. RAKER. We have provided for that in the general homestead law.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I think the same provision should be made here.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your view, in talking with the soldiers and from your observation, that there should be some definite provision provided in this bill for residence upon the home that the soldier obtains?

Mr. JEFFRIES. As to projects?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. If he got an isolated tract, he should live on it, shouldn't he?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Not necessarily. I do not think he should be governed in the same way.

Mr. RAKER. But if you provide a home for the man, say, 60, 80, 100, or 120 acres, and suppose it is an isolated tract, or a separate home, not on a project?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Wouldn't it be your view that for a number of years, say, three, four, or five years, he ought to make that his home?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The same conditions would not prevail and the same necessities for residence there would not prevail on the isolated tract that would on the project. Because of the project, that is necessary—it has been found necessary.

Mr. RAKER. Isn't it your view that the very essence of the success of the home on the farm is the fact that the man lives there and conducts it himself?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And no absent home or tenantry?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And therefore if you are going to do the right thing for the soldiers, we ought to provide in the law for requiring a reasonable amount of residence upon this home when he gets it?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes, sir. I doubt if there would be any serious objection to that.

Mr. SMITH. You stated in answer to an inquiry from Mr. Raker, of California, that you objected to the Secretary of the Interior having any control of the transfer of the entry. Do you not think, before the land is paid for, the Secretary would naturally want to keep track of it, and do you not think if there is any other soldier waiting for this land that he should have a preference over any civilian who wanted to buy?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; if that was provided.

Mr. SMITH. That is the intention of this provision.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, that is the intention, of course; but that might be a different intention with a different man; that is the idea. We don't want it left to individual decisions. For instance, in my recollection, conditions were not in the Interior Department what they

are to-day. Suppose that the Secretary should decide that he could not see it for the settler—he could not see any necessity for allowing the settler to dispose of it to another soldier, wouldn't he have the authority to refuse to assent to the transfer and couldn't he reserve his assent under this to the transfer until such time as some company or some friends or somebody should make the offer and that would come before him? Isn't that a possibility under this?

Mr. SMITH. It is a possibility, but it is not likely with the Secretary of the Interior, who would naturally be disinterested.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Oh, yes. We have had a Secretary of the Interior who was charged very publicly and very broadly with having a direct interest in similar matters, and I remember it very well, and those things might happen again. I stated that I have not the faith in the infallibility of man, of individuals, that I had before I went to France.

Mr. MAYS. You have to have somebody to do this, though?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. MAYS. You do not have any supernatural agency?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. What particular thing happened over there that shattered your faith in man?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Many things—the high percentage of officers who did seem to fall for this superior man stuff.

Mr. FERRIS. Was it Czarism? Was it abuse or what—I ask purely for information?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely; Prussianism of the men who went up from the ranks—a few of them, even—absolutely were tainted by that. I have seen it in officers myself, men who have stood with us, I have seen them separated so widely from us who were their fellows, that you would not dream they were the same men.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, as you are undertaking to cure that in the publication of the magazine referred to and the organization of the soldiers, you will doubtless have a very great influence; so that even if they have Prussianism in the Army and even if the bulk of the men did not approve of the conduct of their officers, it is not your desire or intent to suggest they all have that feeling in the Army as to other governmental agencies?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely not.

Mr. FERRIS. And your statement was not so intended?

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is my sincere desire to aid you men in eliminating from this bill anything that can be eliminated that would subject it to those suspicions. Honestly, I believe in equality. I want to see it a success. I have been engaged in constructive work for years and I have been next to people and helped to prove out this constructive work, and I do know something about the objections, and I want to bring them up here. But I think, for the protection of the Interior Department, that everything should be settled in this bill that can well be settled in this bill, so as to relieve the Interior Department or any individual from any charge of favoritism.

Mr. FERRIS. Was any particular maltreatment or czarism visited on you that intensified your views on it, or is your view of it general and based on general observations?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Nothing personal, although I did run a grave risk of being subjected to an inglorious death two different times through

my having protected the men under me from very brutal treatment from men of higher rank. I stood between and was sent back and reported for insubordination in the face of the enemy, for which the penalty is death. But I got by with it.

Mr. FERRIS. Just what was that occurrence? We are all anxious to know of any maltreatment of the Army.

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is some story.

Mr. SMITH. You volunteered, did you?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes; all of the men in my regiment were volunteers; they were all skilled men.

Mr. BENHAM. I would suggest if the reference to himself is allowed to stand and to go in the record just as he has stated, that he was in a way sent back under arrest, or something like that, that leaving that where it is it reflects upon your record.

The CHAIRMAN. He might explain it if he wishes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. My idea was this; it was in work under fire in the Argonne; and in our company we had a sergeant, first class, who was very ignorant and very domineering. He could not write his own name and could not read an order that came to him, and he was abusive to the men, very abusive to the men. Ordinarily, I was not in direct charge of the men; I was a consulting engineer; but this particular day the sergeant who slept with me, who was in charge of a large detail of men on construction work, reconstructing the bridges that had been blown out, was sick and asked me to take charge of the men. And knowing there was general dissatisfaction with the treatment, among the men, and military authority is counted supreme, especially at the front, so this sergeant, first class, was abusive to the men who were working under me and working very well—they worked especially well under fire. And he told them, among other things, that there was no more man about them than there was a God-damned yellow dog—he used those words—and then he told some of them to place some material in a place that was not the place which I had directed them to place the material. And I had been instructed by the lieutenant who was in command of the company, to take charge of that piece of work and to lay it out as I saw best, and so the men obeyed the instructions I had previously given and refused to deposit the material where he told them to, and so he flew at me in a rage and cursed me and told me to see that those men did what he told them to do. And it was just the last straw.

I told him the men were doing what I told them to do and it was the right thing for them to do and that is what I wanted them to do. And so they went on and did that. Well, we had a few personal words, and I offered to knock his block off, right then and there, but he did not want to try that. And he went on up the road to where the first lieutenant was, and the first lieutenant came back with him and said, "Jeffries, what is the matter?" I said, "Nothing is the matter, sir." I saluted. I said, "The work is going along fine; the men are working good." He says, "Daley tells me you refused to take orders from him." I said, "It is not exactly because of his orders; it is because of his abuse; he is abusive to the men and never treats them like they were men, and I won't stand it any longer; I won't work under him any more, never, and I won't allow him to interfere with men who are working under me; so that is all there is

to it." He said, "You know he outranks you, don't you?" I said, "Yes; I do." He said, "You must take orders from him." I said, "I will not take orders from him." And he said, "Go and report to the captain and tell him I sent you in for insubordination." I did; and I walked 3 miles; you had to walk 3 miles back always to find the captain. And I went back and I reported. The lieutenant had gone in on a motorcycle and made his charge. I stood pat; and I told the captain I was ready to die on that; that I would not go back and work under those conditions; and I acquainted him with the state of mind of the men. I even suggested to him that even his life might not be worth much, it was in danger, because they were about full up. And so he gave me a letter to take back to the first lieutenant, sustaining me. It was the safest thing for him to do at that time. And the lieutenant met me on the road. He had talked with two other sergeants in the company, who had told him, in the meantime, that the company was back of me, and it was kind of scaly business right then. And so he was hurrying back to see me. He was a good man at heart, just a young fellow who had had two years at West Point, but he had this Prussianism drilled into him until he could not see a man in uniform; he just saw a slave. But he saw some men there that day. And he got off his motorcycle and he said, "Jeffries, I want to talk to you about this proposition; I do not mean to say I did right and you were wrong, because I think I was wrong and you were right; but that can not be done in the Army; authority must be maintained. I had to uphold Daley or I would have lost my commission." And so he said, "We must work together. God knows it is hard enough as it is, with the captain overruling me in everything that I do, to try to help the men, and so we have to get together and we can arrange some way that we can get rid of Daley. The same men made Daley that made the captain, and the captain is afraid to fire him; but we can arrange it so he is not on this work and we will do that." So, I said, "Lieutenant, read the letter," and he read the letter and said, "Well, that fixes it all right." It fixed it all right; that sergeant did camp police duty from then on until the demobilization of the regiment last week.

MR. SMITH. And you were left in charge?

MR. JEFFRIES. I was sent back to take charge; yes, sir. But, mind you, this was not freely granted. You see, I was in jeopardy there and I do feel the men ought not to have to be. You see, I still feel that. I had a wife and four children that I think a great deal of, of course, and I took my chance of getting busted with a shell or a bullet many times, and that is the chance you have to take; but I do not think the soldier ought to have to take the chance of being shot for insubordination under those conditions. And we certainly had to take that chance any time we stood against the abuse of men who were loyally working for us. I think only the enlisted men did that; I did not see the officers ever running the risk of losing their commissions, being demoted, in standing up for the men under them. Probably many of them did, but they did not come under my observation; but I have seen enlisted men do that many times.

MR. MAYS. That is the only trouble you had with the officers?

MR. JEFFRIES. Yes; practically. This same lieutenant was the first man in our regiment to join this organization.

MR. SMITH. This lieutenant is in the Regular Army?

Mr. JEFFRIES. He is in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

Mr. SMITH. He is a West Point man?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Two years, I understand, he had had in West Point; but he did not complete his course.

Mr. SMITH. I suggest that the witness be requested in a bill to indicate just what he thinks so that we will have his views in concrete form.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you, without any trouble, prepare amendments and send to me the amendments you think would be desirable to the bill, for the consideration of the committee when we go into the consideration of the bill?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I would be glad to do as much as I can do toward that, but I do not want to take that as a contract.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we will take up your questions and suggestions in executive session, but if you could supplement that with certain amendments which you think might make the bill more workable and satisfactory the committee would like to consider them.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I should be glad to work with anybody who has had experience along that line, but it is a pretty big job and I am pretty busy to undertake it alone, and I would not like to undertake it as a contract.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to impose a burden on you, but if you have the time to do it the committee would appreciate that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Where do you reside in Washington?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I have a room.

Mr. NICHOLS. Where?

Mr. JEFFRIES. 928 Fourteenth Street NW.

(The committee thereupon adjourned to to-morrow, Thursday, June 26, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, June 26, 1919.

The committee met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to insert in the record a paper which Sergt. Jeffries has presented, the prospectus he spoke of yesterday of the American Military Reform Association, of which Mr. Jeffries is president.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

(The paper referred to follows:)

THE AMERICAN MILITARY REFORM ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.; HUGH
JEFFRIES, PRESIDENT.

The American Military Reform Association is the outgrowth of many conferences of soldiers and citizens in the United States and in the American Expeditionary Force camps in France. It is primarily a citizens' organization with certain well-defined purposes, and is in no way opposed to the American Legion, which is a soldiers' organization, nonpartisan and nonpolitical.

PURPOSE.

The object of this association shall be to secure, by appropriate National and State legislation, certain reforms in our military laws and policies which appear to be necessary and to be the inevitable outcome of the experience gained in the World War.

The policy of the association shall be at all times to discountenance any sentiment or action which is aimed in any way to attack, undermine, or discredit the Constitution of the United States, the established law of the land, or legally constituted authority. The association is opposed to the principles proposed by the Bolsheviks, the I. W. W.'s, and any and all organized efforts wherein reform or revolution is sought to be brought about through violence or coercive measures, for the reason that it is recognized by this association that under the Constitution and the laws of the United States all reforms which are deemed necessary by the sovereign people can be brought about in an orderly, peaceable manner, through the rights of free speech, the free press, petition and exercise of suffrage, and that the present established machinery of government, if availed of, is fully sufficient for the carrying out of the will of the people in matters of reform which shall appear to them to be necessary from time to time.

The purpose of this association is to assist in every honorable and legitimate manner in the securing, through appropriate legislation and through co-operative effort and assistance, of the following reliefs and reforms:

1. Immediate and unconditional abolition of all forms of censorship of letters and publications.
2. Complete restoration of the rights of free speech and a free press, including the right to criticize the Government, the Army, and the Navy, and officials, both civil and military.
3. An immediate reform of the court-martial system along the lines proposed and recommended in Senate bill No. 64, introduced by Senator Chamberlain, and House bill No. 367, by Representative Johnson of South Dakota, in the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, in the interests of justice, humanity, and efficiency, as opposed to despotic, tyrannical personal authority and so-called expediency.
4. An immediate review of all courts-martial cases by an unprejudiced judicial tribunal, vested with full powers and jurisdiction, to the end that in so far as may now be possible, justice may be done in all cases where sentences have been illegally imposed or appear to be of undue severity.
5. A change in our national military system wherein all despotic, autocratic, arbitrary authority now held by officers is entirely removed; wherein the line of demarcation in our Army which separates the enlisted men from the officers' personnel under the assumption that the enlisted man has neither honor, intelligence, nor ability, and that the officer is possessed of all these qualifications, but to a degree only commensurate with his rank, is entirely effaced, and wherein all to whom authority may be delegated shall be accountable for the proper exercise of that authority to those over whom the authority is exercised and to the sovereign people, instead of only to those of higher rank.

A system based on the good American principles of justice, humanity, and efficiency which will, in so far as is humanly possible, make the most effective use of our man power and our material resources in our preparations for national defense and in case of war, and under which our Army, in times of peace, may be employed in the great work of national improvements such as construction and improvement of highways, railways, and waterways, and in the development of natural resources with 100 per cent efficiency as the goal.

A system wherein promotions come only as a reward of real merit and wherein the enlisted man is guaranteed an honest opportunity to gain advancement through ability and application, up to the highest rank in the Army, based on the sound principles and practices which have been developed and proven out in the development of the great business and industrial organizations of the United States.

A system wherein the pay of officers and enlisted men shall approximate the pay of men of like ability employed in similar work in our civil life; wherein the requirements as to application and production shall equal or excel those of our business and industrial institutions, and wherein the opportunity for individual initiative and progress shall receive the fullest consideration.

An honest, four-square, democratic, American-made military system in place of the old, despotic, inefficient, unjust, wasteful, caste-breeding system which

has come down to us from the old-time military establishments of England and Germany, and which is unnecessary and wholly unbearable to a liberty-loving, brave, and intelligent people.

MEMBERSHIP.

Membership in the association is open to all citizens and residents of the United States or its dependencies who believe in its purposes and on the following terms, payable in advance, by personal check, draft, money order, or currency: Annual membership, \$1 annually; Sentry membership, \$2 annually; contributing membership, \$5 annually; sustaining membership, \$10 annually; life membership, \$50, one payment; patron membership, \$100, one payment.

NOTE.—All memberships except the \$1 annual membership include a year's subscription to the American Sentry.

Send in your name and address and fee for the class of membership you desire. Ask for information as to the forming of local chapters. Organizers wanted in every locality to further the purposes of the association. An attractive proposition will be offered those who wish to help.

The American Sentry, to be published semimonthly by the association, will carry a great deal of very interesting reading material prepared by some of the best writers in the world, and it will also afford the soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces a chance to tell the truth about their Army experiences in this country and in France and Germany.

Address: "The American Military Reform Association, Hugh Jeffries, president, Warder Building, Washington, D. C."

[This form may be used.]

To the AMERICAN MILITARY REFORM ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C.

Inclosed find \$—— for —— (state class of membership) membership in the American Military Reform Association.

(Name:) —— ———,

(Address:) —— ———.

(Date:) —— ———, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we will have the water-power bill up to-day at 12 o'clock, and I suppose we will want to adjourn promptly at that time. Now, I have learned of no further witnesses opposing the bill. That being true, we have other witnesses here in favor of the bill——

MR. NICHOLS (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if that lady who spoke the other day and said there were some soldiers that she would bring before the committee is here?

The CHAIRMAN. I haven't heard further from her.

Mrs. OXLEY, of Washington, D. C. Mr. Chairman, there is one soldier to be heard to-day, Lieut. Gordon. He is a very busy man, and he said he would try to be here about 11 o'clock, but he has not arrived.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the committee can not wait on the convenience of witnesses very well.

Mrs. OXLEY. Could I make a statement?

The CHAIRMAN. You have already made a statement, Mrs. Oxley.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the status of the time, Mr. Chairman, as to the three hours for the opponents of the bill and the time for the proponents of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Three hours remain for those favoring the bill, and the opponents of the bill have used two hours—nine minutes short of two hours.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are there any more witnesses, or any more that desire to offer further testimony?

The CHAIRMAN. I haven't heard of any more, excepting the statement of Mrs. Oxley this morning. You heard that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has anybody asked to be heard in favor of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No one has asked to be heard against the bill. There are four here who are in favor of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some more in favor of it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Why not proceed with those, then, Mr. Chairman, and leave the time till later if the opponents come in?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be satisfactory, I think. Mr. Hansen is here. Mr. Hansen, will you come forward, please? State to the committee your name and address.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM L. HANSEN, OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is William L. Hansen, of Salt Lake City, Utah. May I here suggest that at a meeting of my associate delegates last evening I was asked to represent this matter to-day, and I took the liberty to write down what I would like to say, and with your permission I will read it.

I ask that I be permitted to continue until I get through, after which I will be very pleased to answer any questions that the committee may desire to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to accord you that privilege. Mr. HANSEN (reading):

MEMORANDUM.

I am William L. Hansen, of Salt Lake City, Utah, a bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and am in charge of the colonization work of the church. I might also just add that I am the son of a worthy pioneer farmer who drove an ox team from Omaha into the Salt Lake Valley in 1856, walking almost the entire distance, and who is to-day an ardent supporter of this most laudable proposal.

I wish to say, gentlemen, that I have made a very careful study of the Mondell bill. I have conferred with men of practical experience in colonization work both singly and collectively, not only in Utah, but other States of the intermountain region, before starting for the East. I was one of the committee appointed by the Governors of Utah, Idaho, and Nevada, who met on the 7th day of this month in the office of our own capitol building to consider technically and in detail all of the phases of this bill. Together we put this bill right under the searchlight, subjecting it to the most careful consideration from every point of view and unanimously moved to indorse same with some minor recommendations.

Since arriving in Washington I have conferred with officials of the Interior Department as to the manner in which such a law would be administered and satisfactory explanations have been made in every instance.

I am now prepared to say that I approve the Mondell bill and am convinced that with these minor amendments which I shall suggest it is well calculated to accomplish the objects for which it was framed.

In the second place, I wish to say that in giving our approval to this measure we are speaking from a practical rather than a theoretical point of view. The Mormon pioneers entered Salt Lake Valley July 24, 1847, and we are basing our conclusions concerning this bill upon our whole experience of 72 years. I think it is generally conceded that we have been successful colonizers and have done our full share in building up the western country. We have, of course, learned some very valuable lessons in the course of an experience which has taken hundreds of thousands of men of very small means, including

many who were practically penniless and established them successfully in self-sustaining homes of their own. I am somewhat surprised, and very much gratified, to find that the lessons of this experience are embodied to a very considerable extent in the Mondell bill.

Another point which I want to make very clear is this: We have not considered this bill merely from the standpoint of Utah and the West, nor from the standpoint of the work in which I am personally engaged, the colonization work of the Mormon Church, but I can see no reason whatever why this proposed law should not be just as successful in every other part of the country as in Utah, and I see no reason why it should not work as well with all elements of people, and of all denominations or people of no religion whatever, as it will certainly work with my own people. I say this, because I believe the Mondell bill does embody principles of intelligent executive power, of care for the soldier's welfare, and of community interests which would make it possible also to build up and develop successfully prosperous communities in any part of the United States where suitable lands and opportunities are available.

I am also of the firm opinion that if the owners of nonproducing lands in the North and East, viewed by us from our car windows as we passed through these States on our way to this city, would earnestly cooperate with the true spirit and intent of the Mondell bill, they would be great benefactors not only to the soldiers and their communities but would add impetus and strength to one of the most laudable resources we have within the reach of our own Nation.

The problem of my own people from the beginning has been how to take men with little or no money, very often with little or no agricultural experience, and accomplish three things:

First. To give them employment, such as clearing and cultivating land, teach them the art of proper irrigation, building roads, ditches, canals, reservoirs, etc., and doing everything that is necessary to convert a raw wilderness into a productive agricultural district.

Second. How to handle these men so that they would become industrious, loyal, and self-supporting citizens, lovers of home and home life with its accompanying desires to own their own homes, their own little farms, and be permanent residents and community benefactors; how to save their money from small earnings and combine same with their own labors in building their own homes and in making the necessary essential improvements around same.

Third. How to organize these settlers into communities so that they might have all the necessary institutions of educational, commercial, religious, social, and industrial life that is within the power of the people to give.

I want to ask you gentlemen of the committee, Are these not the identical problems with which you are called upon to deal as lawmakers in considering the welfare of our returning soldiers? Well, these were the problems faced by President Brigham Young at the beginning of the Utah settlement two years previous to the discovery of gold in California. These are the problems with which the successors of President Young have dealt to this present hour and with which I am dealing to-day as head of the colonization department under President Heber J. Grant.

It has been suggested that it might be of some value to you to open the door of our entire experience in building hundreds of farms and tens of thousands of homes not only throughout the State of Utah but in several other States and some foreign countries, including the Dominion of Canada. You possess certain very great advantages as compared with the pioneers of our work. You have the advantage of abundant capital and of all modern equipments. You can sit down and figure out the cost of a given project or even of the entire policy and then draw upon the credit of the United States to furnish the money. You have at your command the best talent available in every part and branch of your work, whereas we had to develop talent and use such implements and other limited means within our reach. You can operate on a very large scale in clearing land, building works, and doing other essential things with the most up-to-date machinery, with an abundance of labor at your command, where we were often hampered not only by lack of capital but by small numbers and poor facilities.

You have a great reservoir of the finest young men on earth, 25,000 of which came from our own ranks and are of good pioneer stock. With such resources to draw upon for your settlers, young men inured to outdoor life, schooled in discipline, and animated not only by the desire to make homes for themselves but to perform other great service for their country. We had to take settlers of all ages, all nationalities, and under all conditions, not a few of which had

passed beyond the days of youth and were strange to outdoor tasks. But, gentlemen, we now have the advantage over those who are called upon to write this law. We have the advantage of 70 years' experience in actually doing the things you are talking about doing, and whatever they say about the Mormon people no one has ever yet said that they do not know how to do this kind of a job. Their sternest critics have never denied their industry, their thrift, their ability to take a company of poor men and convert them into a settlement of land proprietors owning their own homes, working for themselves, paying their way, and fulfilling the obligations of the highest type of American citizens.

Now, gentlemen, if you want the benefit of our experience I am here to be of any service within my power and to answer any questions you may care to ask me, but first permit me to submit my suggestions concerning a few minor amendments to this bill.

In conclusion may I just say that I am for the Mondell bill with the following suggestions and for the spirit of this legislation in offering an opportunity for our soldier boys to own their own farms, for the following reasons:

The farmer is truthfully recognized as the most independent man in the world to-day.

There is no more ideal home for the family than the modern up-to-date farm which is also the true source of natural wealth.

According to printed statistics 85 per cent of the rich men of the United States became wealthy through the advance in real estate and its resources.

It is also said that at the present rate of increasing city population and lagging agricultural activities that congestion, labor troubles, distressed industrial conditions, and suffering are inevitable which can only be relieved by the farmer.

Gentlemen, let us help these soldiers "Forward to the farm."

Now, the suggestions that we considered and talked over at the table in the governor's office in Utah have the following thoughts:

In your opening paragraph of the bill it reads: "To provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands." As it reads we desire—we feel that that wording is a little misleading, and would like to suggest: "The acquisition and development of lands, to be known as the soldier settlement act."

Mr. TAYLOR. You would change the title of the bill?

Mr. HANSEN. We changed the title by making it read instead of "reclamation" make it read "acquisition and development," because all of the work is not intended to be reclamation work.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand it, there are other things contemplated besides reclamation.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; and it is a little misleading and throws us way up into the big, cold reclamation projects; so, to bring it a little nearer home and make it answer the true intent of the purpose, we feel that that word would probably be a little more fitting.

On page 2, line 17, we thought the words "a commissioner or commissioners" might be inserted instead of the words "a representative of the governor," and also to insert the words "or Territory." So that it would read, "approved by a commissioner or commissioners of the governor of the State or Territory in which the lands are located."

Our governor has already appointed commissioners for this purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Those commissioners would still be representative, wouldn't they?

Mr. HANSEN. Possibly so.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the idea of using the word "Territory" instead of the word "State?" We haven't got any Territories.

Mr. HANSEN. Not instead; just insert the words "or Territory."

Mr. TAYLOR. So as to make it applicable to the Hawaiian Islands or Alaska?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; or any place that might be chosen to be used.

Mr. FERRIS. Is Bamberger still governor of Utah?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir. On page 3, line 1, there is the same thought that is contained in the introduction, instead of having it read, "for the permanent reclamation or development," have it read, "for the acquisition and development of the lands." On the same page, line 9, the words "in no single case exceed \$1,200," we thought the words "\$2,000 or \$2,500" should be substituted. We really spoke of \$2,000, but I am more inclined to favor \$2,500 for the following reasons:

By virtue of a loaning fund made available about four years ago I now have a great deal to do with men who come and want assistance, who already have the title to their lands, who are out on the frontiers and who own their lands, and they are pretty well along, but their homes are deplorable and uninviting, and they are not satisfactory or agreeable for their families and young people. It is not what they would desire for their homes, and so in similar cases the soldier may come to you and ask for some money to make and build his improvements; he doesn't want it for anything else; he doesn't want it to acquire land; he doesn't want any assistance to buy live stock or implements, or anything, but he would like to have some assistance in building a home. He will put up his own labor against that, and as building material is very high, if he should want to have a little more money, I think it should be left within the discretion of the State commissions to use their judgment in such cases. Of course, as very often—we have no rules in our limited regulations about that, and it has thus far been left up to me to decide. I make the recommendations to my committee of three, and if these recommendations are approved they indorse it and the secretary and treasurer is authorized to advance the money. And I think that the man on the job at the particular time is probably in a position and desires to hold it back as much as he can, but there are exceptional cases where \$1,200 would not be sufficient to meet the needs.

The CHAIRMAN. Do your observations in this particular relate to the farm units, to the colony, or the segregated farm units?

Mr. HANSEN. In this particular it is possible in new developments and settlements, and is not restricted particularly to any settlement plan.

The same thing would apply to another clause that is just similar to it—I will come back again here, but on page 5, line 2, this same thing applies to \$800, which we would like to recommend be made to read "\$1,500."

Mr. MAYS. Line 10, page 5?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes. For the same purpose that they may have everything else and may not want any more assistance in any way, but they lack a few hogs or sheep or a few milch cows and some live stock around their place. Eight hundred dollars doesn't go very far for a man under that condition at the present price of good cattle, which we want to recommend and which we are recommending that they get, good registered stock, or good choice stock, and so in order to do that \$800 doesn't go very far. It may be that he wouldn't want any money for any other consideration but that.

Going back to page 4, line 9, I hardly feel that 5 per cent is enough to ask of the purchaser when you are advancing him a great amount of money—a large amount—and I would like to recommend that that first payment read 10 per cent of the sale price instead of 5. Now, the reason is this: That while we want to help the boys without any means, we do not want to place five or six or seven thousand dollars, as the case may be, in their own possession if they themselves neither have the resource nor the ability to raise one-tenth of the amount that we are intrusting or loaning them and giving over into their hands. And I think, because of this, that there will be opportunities for them to become educated along the different lines that are provided for them in this bill; that it will be possible for them without and handicap at all to bring and deposit at least 10 per cent of the purchase price, which will give them a more individual interest in the proposition itself than it would if they had practically no interest. A man could come and take a farm and take the crop off the first year, and he can deteriorate the value of that property very materially and go away and take his crops, and you are out the money, if they were so inclined. Now, it doesn't happen very often, but in my experience it does happen—in the goodness of their hearts they have no intention of doing it at all when they enter into this contract with us, but I have found that the more you can get a man interested personally with you in any business, the better is his ability to execute that work. So I suggest that that be made to read 10 per cent instead of 5 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you require under your plan?

Mr. HANSEN. We have no definite plan for the loaning fund of our church. It has been left largely to my recommendation. Often I meet people that I don't have to give a 5 cent piece. They say, "Mr. Hansen, we don't want any money; all we want is an opportunity to get in right. We know that you are in a position to advise us and to help us and to get us started in right so that we are not going to be held up—using their phrase—by any real estate stunt, or anything of that kind. You help me get in right and that is all I ask of you. I am willing to fight my own battle and get through it." And some don't want anything but advice and the right opportunity. Others want only a small amount, \$150, \$500, \$1,000; some of them come with four or five or ten thousand dollars, and all along the line, so that, Mr. Chairman, we don't have any restrictions. It depends entirely upon the case, which has a personal investigation and receives personal recommendation from me to my committee, so we have no fixed amount, but it depends altogether on each case.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Then, you do put men on without any capital at all, if they are honest and reliable and industrious?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; we often do that, very often. As, for example, refugees from Mexico. But I would say this: That my greatest success has been where they have been pretty well interested themselves. I lost quite a few when we started this financial-assistance plan. I lost a few of them in the goodness of my heart and my endeavor to help them, but I soon found that my success was not measured by the number of people that I could assist, but the success that I could cause them to enjoy.

Mr. FERRIS. What character of land do you put them on—public lands, or State lands, or private lands?

Mr. HANSEN. It varies entirely with the circumstances. Sometimes we help them out to a new reclamation or different places out of the State; sometimes we just put them onto new lands. Some of them want to go where the lands can be obtained cheap; they want to get down on the ground floor; they want to get in with all the advantages and help build it up. Others are married and intermarried and their social and other connections are such that they don't want to go away from their own settlement. They want to branch out, but they also want to be sort of a leader in the community where they are.

Mr. FERRIS. What I am trying to get at is, do you put them on there as tenants, or do you put them on there with a view of acquiring homes of their own?

Mr. HANSEN. Ownership is the only way. Tenancy is a failure, and it will be just as hard to get people to be successful tenants as it is to get them to work for day's wages. They want to own their own lands.

Mr. FERRIS. I agree with you on that. So that when the applicant comes to you for the purpose of acquiring a home or land to farm, your efforts are to get him located somewhere where it will be acceptable to him?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Where family relations and community relations are agreeable?

Mr. HANSEN. We have to consider all those things.

Mr. FERRIS. And you don't have any particular colony to put him in, do you?

Mr. HANSEN. No.

Mr. FERRIS. You find something that is acceptable to him and help him on it? Is that it?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. And you make loans to him?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; we make loans to them.

Mr. FERRIS. Is that a church fund?

Mr. HANSEN. That has been a church fund, which was—you might be interested to know this, that because of our interest and the limited overhead expense that we have in connection with this, and the degree of success which has followed our people, in this recent move, was brought about by some philanthropist or some good-hearted capitalist, who left to the church an estate which was immediately matched by the church and is used for this loaning purpose. That was really, gentlemen, the impetus of this particular move.

Mr. FERRIS. Have you acquired lands with that fund?

Mr. HANSEN. We buy no lands; we help them buy teams, harness, wagons, if necessary. To one man we will loan a little money to acquire his land; another will make his own arrangements for land and we buy him his team and outfit and equipment. Others possibly have all they need, and all there is for us to do is to go to the store and arrange a year's supply for them, seeds, and so on, and help them with implements until they can get a crop out and start it. Our work is very much varied in that line.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the church own large areas of land?

MR. HANSEN. No; we have no lands at all that we are selling to anybody.

MR. FERRIS. Only just as you acquire them for the individual applicant as they come along?

MR. HANSEN. We have 800 bishops, I was going to say, who are all anxious to have enterprising men come to them, and they do anything—furnish supplies and cooperate with them—to get them interested.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. How long has this plan been in operation?

MR. HANSEN. As outlined here, as already stated, it is nearly four years old now.

THE CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the particular plan?

MR. HANSEN. That I have just outlined, where we have started to be of help, have made an organized effort to help our people back to the farm. It was brought about by the influx to the city and the lagging on the farm. Our cities became overpopulated with men that understand the art of agriculture, and the lands were lying dormant and there was a move on to get them from the cities back to the farms, and the time when this effort, as I say, especially concentrated with this organization, was made, was about four years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN. But you have had your colonization plan going for years?

MR. HANSEN. Ever since we started to settle in Utah under very close supervision. This assistance plan is an addition to our old plan, you know.

MR. TAYLOR. Sort of an evolutionary development of it?

MR. HANSEN. Yes; trying to keep up with the times.

MR. TAYLOR. Now, will you go ahead with the amendments that you have to further suggest?

MR. HANSEN. On line 15, of the same page, page 4, it reads, "at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, payable annually," for—where does it say that it is for a period of 40 years? The amendment that we suggest in that line is that it be 4 per cent for the first 20 years and 5 per cent thereafter, for this reason: You have helped them to get a start, and 20 years is long enough to help anybody get a good start. You are making the terms very liberal and doing everything for him; his farm has increased in value; you hold the title; the title is not yet in his name, and if he is anxious to get the title in his name, he can go to the Federal loan bank or other banks and borrow money, easy enough to pay you up, or he can continue with you if he desires along the same plan. I would make it optional for him, whether he desires to remain with you, you holding the title until you get through, until he redeems it; or he has the privilege at the expiration of 20 years of redeeming or taking title in his own name and going to the bank and borrowing more money if he chooses, and that this land will permit, and buying live stock or making such improvements that will be worth enough to him so that he can afford very well to pay the difference between 5 per cent or 4 per cent and the rate of interest he would have to pay otherwise.

MR. FERRIS. Wouldn't you give him the option of paying out earlier than 20 years?

MR. HANSEN. Yes; decidedly so.

MR. FERRIS. What option would you give him?

MR. HANSEN. I would put a clause in the contract providing that he could take it up—there could be no objection on the part of the Government, I would give him the option to redeem the whole thing and take the title over in his name at any time that he can and desires to do it.

MR. FERRIS. After paying out in full?

MR. HANSEN. Yes.

MR. FERRIS. At any time?

MR. HANSEN. At any time; yes, sir. That creates, then, a fund—or the money is back in the Treasury, and as we use it for a revolving fund, then somebody else could have the benefit of it all the quicker and could immediately take it and go on.

MR. TAYLOR. And if it was less than 4 per cent, it would be an incentive to him not to get title, because that is cheaper than he could get money any place else, and cheaper than the Government of the United States has to pay on its own bonds.

MR. HANSEN. We don't know what the rate of interest will be 40 years from now.

MR. FERRIS. And, of course, all the years that that title has been held, the property is taxed free. There is another consideration that will keep him from acquiring title.

MR. HANSEN. Well, I don't know. That is a point that I have not gone into, but we always ask them to pay the taxes.

MR. FERRIS. You do in your lands, but so long as the Federal Government withholds title, and until such time as title is finally granted, there could not be any taxes on Government property.

MR. TAYLOR. There could be taxes on the improvements.

MR. FERRIS. Yes; but I am speaking of the land.

MR. HANSEN. Is that just exactly what we want to convey?

MR. FERRIS. That is the logical sequence. Now, whether you want to modify that is the question. You know the Government doesn't allow its property to be taxed in any event.

MR. HANSEN. No.

MR. FERRIS. Either public buildings acquired or land, and as long as these titles were withheld from these applicants without the bill making any definite recital about it, of course the land would be tax free. So I was thinking your amendment might have a good deal of merit in it, because by raising the interest it would be an additional inducement to the fellow to pay out, rather than go on tax free at a low rate of interest, under which conditions there might come a time when it would be unfair to the surrounding community.

MR. HANSEN. Well, that was my idea.

MR. FERRIS. There are sections in my State now that are in that condition.

MR. HANSEN. We have them, when they sign a contract with us for a series of years, come back at a much earlier period and say, "I need money. I can make more money by buying a bunch of good sheep or a bunch of good dairy cows, something that can bring me more interest, and I want to take up my loan. I want to get title." And we go over and make arrangements and get the money.

MR. FERRIS. So you don't think it would be a wise scheme to keep them as long as five years on the land before they can come in and pay out and acquire the title?

MR. HANSEN. I wouldn't have it under five years.

Mr. TAYLOR. You want to make them become permanent settlers and residents?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Would five years be too long?

Mr. HANSEN. No; I don't think so.

Mr. FERRIS. You stated a moment ago that you allowed them to get title any time. That would mean one day or one month or one year.

Mr. HANSEN. There is just one thought in connection with this. I don't know the detailed route of work that the Government contemplates in administration. That is what I am not familiar with. I know with my own records and the way we keep them that we are prepared at any time to accept their money. They can come and get their title at any time they choose.

Mr. HERSMAN. You wouldn't allow him to sell out his contract, would you?

Mr. HANSEN. No, sir; absolutely not.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Except to another soldier; wouldn't you be willing to do that?

Mr. HANSEN. Not without the written consent of the Government. I would make that provision, of course.

Mr. HERSMAN. While you are on that subject of 40 years, don't you think that 20 years is long enough to pay for this land in any case; that if a man can't pay for it in 20 years it isn't a good investment for him; that 20 years is as long as it could reasonably be expected to be extended?

Mr. HANSEN. Well, you are making quite a gap there, you know, for a young man that doesn't have to pay taxes for 40 years and pays 4 per cent interest. It is a very strong inducement, of course, for him to hold on, but I do personally, without going into that in detail—I haven't gone into that so much in detail, but personally I can imagine no case—in our own connections we could not think of 20 years. It would be absolutely beyond our limit, you know. We don't do that. Now, what the capacity of the Government is I don't know.

Mr. HERSMAN. Well, the question is, if a man couldn't pay for it in 20 years, it **would not** be a good investment for him.

Mr. HANSEN. That is the natural conclusion.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What is the length of term on which you loan?

Mr. HANSEN. It varies. Some of them only wanted six months, or until after harvest; another wants it for a year, another five years; but I don't think that in any of our instances I have a single case where it exceeds five years.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, Mr. Hansen, in a number of States, in the disposition of their State lands they give them 40 years.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, I know.

Mr. FERRIS. Quite a number of those have come under my notice.

Mr. HANSEN. I didn't attempt to go into that. I took it for granted that that had been arranged, and I suggest the raise of interest after 40 years, if it is going to be 40 years.

On page 5, line 16, it is provided:

That no such loans shall exceed 60 per centum of the cost of the live stock and equipment purchased.

I think that should be raised to 75 per cent. Live stock is an awfully good security. Bankers will allow a cattleman to go out and draw on them any time for 75 per cent of the value of the stock that they are getting, and he may not have the money available but may have splendid security that would satisfy us, and I think that I would say 75 per cent instead of 60 per cent.

Mr. HERSMAN. Just on that point there, 75 and 60 per cent, I had expected to raise that same question in the committee—don't you think that 75 per cent is entirely too much on machinery, extending over a period of five years? Now it is not too much on cattle, providing for the increase of the cattle, of course, and the Secretary will do that, but don't you think that 75 per cent is entirely too much on machinery extending over a period of five years?

Mr. HANSEN. No; I don't think so. His machinery has to be kept up. He has to keep it up. Of course it deteriorates, but it is always replaced.

Mr. HERSMAN. Now your own experience as a farmer will certainly lead you—I would imagine it would—would lead you to believe that any machinery that is five years old is not worth 40 per cent of its original value.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; we grant that.

Mr. HERSMAN. It is not worth 30 per cent of its original value. I can't imagine any machinery we could buy that would be worth 30 per cent at the end of five years. Then why isn't 75 per cent too much to loan on machinery unless you are just going to make him a gift of it provided he fails? That is not so with cattle and the increase on cattle.

Mr. HANSEN. Well, I haven't gone into that. I haven't had occasion to test that out. We never sustained any losses that way.

Mr. HERSMAN. But you don't extend loans on machinery five years.

Mr. HANSEN. It deteriorates very materially. I realize that. There are a lot of these details that would have to be left to the discretion of the commissioners or the party on the job at the time. The moral risk with a man is often much more, of course, than the other.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What would you think of this suggestion, Mr. Hansen, that these loans on equipment and stock shall not exceed a period of two years, and then be subjected to renewal, so that the Government in that way could keep close track of it?

Mr. HANSEN. That involves an awful lot of work.

Mr. HERSMAN. What did you say?

Mr. HANSEN. That involves an awful lot of work, renewing and going into these records; and I think that your provision would be safe on that. I wouldn't ask for a renewal in two years.

Mr. BENHAM. Mr. Hansen, I would like to ask this question. We are all more or less familiar with what you are doing, and are sure that it is a success. Would you say that, in the main, your work at present, and during the past several years, is with the project plan as suggested in the Mondell bill, or a major portion of it individual ownership, segregated lands?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; that has been chiefly it on ours.

Mr. HERSMAN. What has been chiefly yours?

Mr. HANSEN. Individual work, instead of large collective plans—as I understood your question.

Mr. BENHAM. Yes; that was the question.

Mr. HERSMAN. You tried to arrange them in colonies?

Mr. HANSEN. The origin, of course, was in colonies, always, and until we get established; and we very often are called upon to go out and start little colonies. We take as many families as we can get together, and put out there and let them grow naturally themselves; put out there on these colonies. But the old plan, of course, is to get your families started in a community, and the natural growth develops them.

Mr. BENHAM. One more question, Mr. Hansen. Do you find the loaning on these individual holdings any more risky than in the case of colonies?

Mr. HANSEN. No; we have lost but very little. The fact of the matter is, I don't know at this time of any accounts that we would lose in connection with that. We take every precaution, the details of which I would be glad to submit later, in drawing up the contract in connection with that. I would be very glad to be helpful in a lot of details. In the contract we make provision for that. Our risks are now very small. You don't have to take any risks. Let them improve the ground; the land is increasing in value all the time, and the live stock is increasing in value, and if you will get them to start the game fair with you and play the game fair, you are absolutely safe. It is one of the safest investments we can possibly loan money on.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Hansen, along that line of individual colonies, as is proposed in this bill, that is quite an important question, I imagine, under consideration before this committee, and your testimony undoubtedly will carry weight, because you have had experience. I wish to go into that a little more fully.

I wish you would state the advantages, if you thing there are any, over the system that is proposed by this Mondell bill, of assembling them in colonies, to have the advantages of churches and homes that they may have in this new settlement, or loaning money to individual persons, to select as they may see fit in different isolated places and maybe in the State or near their own homes. I wish you would go a little more fully into that, because it is a question that has bothered me somewhat, and I know that question is going to come under consideration when this committee goes into committee of the whole in executive session, and I would like to have you go a little more fully into that one phase of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You want him, Mr. Hersman, to go into the respective merits of the colony plan and the segregated unit plan?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes; he has had experience. He says he has loaned money both ways, and I would like to have him go into those two features.

Mr. HANSEN. Now, we haven't had just such an organized effort as is proposed in detail here by the soldier-settlement plan. We have never gone into a community with this recent financial assistance, as is proposed in this plan, and opened it systematically, laid it out, planted it, planned and arranged for little community centers, such as the plan that was submitted for my consideration yesterday in the

office of Mr. Davis, our Reclamation Director General, provided. We have never had enough money for such an experience; we have never gone into it as he has planned.

Mr. HERSMAN. You mean as represented in this bill?

Mr. HANSEN. As represented in this bill; but I believe that it can be made a great success. I think if you were to confine it exclusively to that plan it would not be a success, but I do think that that is one of the appealing features of this bill and will be very helpful and very useful in developing the ideas that it is desired to obtain and to get the results.

But we have practically the three stages. If Utah is to participate in this fund, I would suggest something like this: There is a little community at Moxeda, on Utah Lake, now that was taken up, a project that was planned—beautifully planned and arranged—and they came from the East out there and started to colonizing on their own methods; but it was not a success, and it failed and went into other hands and failed again. It is in the hands of a receiver, and is now ripe and ready, with trees growing and everything all ready to jump right onto and put in a little money in developing the systems—the water systems. That would be the first. This could be started within 30 days, as far as that goes, just after the word was said to go.

Then, there we have another project that could be started as soon as the boys would be ready. We have the plan there to build a reservoir on one of our rivers and start work and give them work immediately, all of the preliminary engineering work having been done. That would provide for largely the infiltration method in colonies of from 10—but in colonies, I will say, of from 10 to 15, 25, 75, and 100 families, but it is intermingled with other families.

Then the big plan, where we want to work out still another very large project on the reservation.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me interrupt the witness for a moment. Where is this word "infiltration plan" as applying to taking up lands—where does that come from? Who is the sire of that word? To me it is a very great misnomer and a very displeasing and inappropriate word. Who is it that fathers and applies such a word as that?

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know the etymology of it.

Mr. FERRIS. The "infiltration plan"—to me it is all out of joint. Do you know the origin of it?

Mr. HANSEN. No; I do not. It has been a little confusing to me. Often I am asked, "Are you for the infiltration plan or the soldier settlement plan?" and I can really not draw an intelligent distinction between the two principles. We all have the same purpose in view, and in discussing the matter a little further I always find we are exactly the same, whether it is the infiltration plan or the soldier settlement plan. Before we get through we are right together on the two plans.

Mr. FERRIS. I don't like the word at all.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Would not the word "segregated" or "isolated" be more expressive?

Mr. FERRIS. It seems to me anything would be more intelligible than that word.

The CHAIRMAN. You might say "individual."

Mr. WHITE. How about "individual segregative"? Is that a good word, Mr. Ferris?

Mr. FERRIS. It seems better to me, Mr. White. This "infiltration" plan—I don't think 1 per cent of the country will know what that means.

Mr. MAYS. It sounds like it ought to be applied to a water system.

Mr. FERRIS. I have heard it, but it don't grow in grace with me.

Mr. WHITE. It doesn't grow in your country. It is not indigenous to Oklahoma.

Mr. FERRIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of a certain colony plan failure. What was the reason of the failure of that?

Mr. HANSEN. Well, the promoters didn't have the interests of the people at heart. It was their own interests that they had.

The CHAIRMAN. Who did not?

Mr. HANSEN. The promoters of the big project. It was a promotion scheme. Somebody was to make a lot of money out of it, and it was a money-making proposition instead of getting right into the germ of benefiting the community and the people there. That is why they failed, and why anybody should fail.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a speculative proposition?

Mr. HANSEN. Purely speculative; yes.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you a question. Don't you think, generally speaking, that that is the common danger that threatens these plans?

Mr. HANSEN. That is where these promotions and projects seem to have to battle so hard for approval just at this hour and at this particular time, because of just that condition.

Mr. MAYS. After they got these settlers on the land they neglected to pay any attention to them. Isn't that the trouble?

Mr. HANSEN. Well, they carry it for a while and then their money pans out and they get discouraged, and the bills become due, and then they begin to close in on the people, and then they are sold under the hammer, and some others think it is a good thing and they try it. I always find it the nice thing to get in about the third man on a proposition like that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do you undertake, Mr. Hansen, to keep in close touch with the farmers to whom you loan money, to see them every two or three months as to how they are getting along?

Mr. HANSEN. It has been my duty to visit them and to advise with them. I go through their farms and take an inventory every year. I go out and walk around with them on their land, look over their crops, consult with them, and advise with them. I take an agriculturist with me and say to him, "I have got some boys here that I want you to take care of. They are a little lame in this direction. Bolster them up and give them personal attention and put them under the personal supervision of our agricultural agent."

In some instances it has been necessary for me to go and appeal to the educational interests, and in one particular instance lately, where my young men were getting away from me, I had to have an educator come out on the ground and live with the boys and work with them in their homes, get up early and go and see how they cared for their horses, how they hitched them up, and how

they tended to their implements, and all the details of their work; and in that way I feel that that has been the big point in my success, because of the individual personal interest that they feel with me, and naturally if you loan them a little money you are the big man, and when I come I always get the fattest chicken and they make quite a fuss over me.

MR. SMITH of Idaho. Is that the reason you like to go?

MR. HANSEN. That is one of the reasons I like to go.

MR. NICHOLS. Mr. Hansen, I was called out of the room and did not hear your preliminary remarks—maybe you covered this. I just want to ask a few questions, if I may. Does your State aid men to obtain lands and develop them?

MR. HANSEN. No; only in this connection: The State has appropriated \$1,000,000—the State of Utah—to cooperate with this movement.

MR. NICHOLS. But you spoke of some experience you had in the matter of placing men on the farms and the development of the land.

MR. HANSEN. That I spoke of particularly in reference to our church—the Mormon Church.

MR. NICHOLS. Your church, then, does it aid men to go on the farms, loan them money, etc.?

MR. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

MR. NICHOLS. How much would they loan them? How high would they go?

MR. HANSEN. It varies. I believe I made the explanation. I would be glad to make it again—we have no stipulated amount. It varies anywhere from what we call good advice and helpfulness in getting started to \$2,000.

MR. NICHOLS. You go as high as \$2,000?

MR. HANSEN. Yes. We have tried to hold it to very few cases where we have to go up to that.

MR. NICHOLS. Would you go as far 20 years in that case?

MR. HANSEN. No; five years is our limit. That is as far as we consider our limited funds will permit us to go.

MR. NICHOLS. And what rate of interest do you charge?

MR. HANSEN. We usually charge 7 per cent. Sometimes in extreme cases we have charged 8 per cent, but 7 per cent is the standard. It is not the interest we are after. We just want them to feel the obligation.

MR. NICHOLS. Now, you go as high as \$2,000. That covers the payment on the farm and also the equipment—the stock?

MR. HANSEN. It is applied in various ways. Sometimes we only use it for equipment; sometimes for stock only; sometimes for land only. It is seldom, if ever, that we attempt to start them out—we wouldn't start them out on the ground floor with equipment and everything, amounting to \$2,000, without any resources on their part at all.

MR. NICHOLS. As I understand it, then, you have loaned as high as \$2,000 to a good prospect?

MR. HANSEN. Yes.

MR. NICHOLS. For a period not longer than five years and usually 7 per cent?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it ever any less?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; and if a man comes in and says he has a hard struggle and puts up a plea and says, "I would like to have my interest abated," I would recommend—and in case after case—we abate their interest as long as we can get the principal back and start it over again and start it to rolling. But they sign the note for 7 per cent.

Mr. MAYS. Do you believe that by charging such a rate of interest the individuals are induced to pay off the principal sooner?

Mr. HANSEN. That is the purpose. We want them to pay the principal and get the money back for somebody else. Often after we get them started their securities are enhanced and they go and get the money for a little less interest and pay up, which pleases us very much.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, in this bill, Mr. Hansen, you call attention to page 3, line 9, that \$1,200, you think that should be increased to \$2,000?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir; \$2,500.

Mr. NICHOLS. And would you leave the words in "nor in excess of three-quarters of the cost or value of the improvements"?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. And on the 5 per cent initial payment, page 4, line 9, you would increase that to 10 per cent?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, then, the initial payment of the soldier would be considerably increased by the increase of the first payment from 5 per cent to 10 per cent and the increase indicated from \$1,200 to \$2,000 in the loan and the increase indicated on page 5, line 10, from \$800 to \$1,500.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. As it is now, it has been estimated that the soldier would approximately have to pay \$1,200 as an initial payment on all, covering all, so that would increase it materially.

Mr. HANSEN. You say he would have to pay \$1,200?

Mr. NICHOLS. It has been estimated here by Mr. Davis and others that approximately the soldier would have to pay \$1,200. Of course, this would increase that amount of the initial payment of the soldier.

Mr. HANSEN. You will find so many conditions confronting you, your local committeemen in taking these boys, that they will find their own level of safety. We all have just one purpose in view. We want to help them and we want to adopt those measures which in the main will be the guiding post, the mile post, to those who are making this contract with them. But you will see, and I will see, as we come in contact with them, that it will be necessary to make personal investigation and examination of those boys before you will give any of them anything, I don't care what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean before you make your selection?

Mr. HANSEN. I would have to meet them in order to say how much we should give them and just how much we will give them in our own district, not barring anybody.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Hansen, some of the boys would be excluded from this, then?

MR. HANSEN. I can't imagine anybody that would be excluded, if they have the purpose of this bill in mind to be agricultural beneficiaries and to get a home of their own. The law is big enough and broad enough to help anybody that has the purpose of this bill at heart, and what the Government could not do the State will do, and what the State won't do the individual would do, and you will find help rallying around you to such an extent that you will not be handicapped for means, and if you get through with this amount successfully they will be only too glad to double the appropriation or to add to it as you succeed with the purpose of this bill.

MR. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Hansen, would a man be excluded because he didn't appreciate the purpose of the bill, or would he be excluded because he would not be considered, we will say, the right kind of a man to put on one of these projects?

MR. HANSEN. Well, now, I would not like to go into the personality of the measure, so far as the boys are concerned.

MR. NICHOLS. You said that sooner or later the Government would reach the point where they would have to pick their men.

MR. HANSEN. I didn't mean just that. I don't mean it to be intended that way. I mean this, that we want to help the boy who wants to help himself in this direction, and the law and the commissioners, the men having the details of that, are the best judges as to just the amount and just how and just where they will be helped in this direction. Now, I wouldn't say that I would debar anybody. I could not, would not—it is not intended to, but I think that the measure is for agricultural purposes—for getting a home on the farm. Hundreds of the soldiers will not want a home on the farm, but this is the farmer boy's day just now, to get a home on the farm; later on the day will come for the boy that wants to enter into some other enterprise or some other business, that doesn't want a farm, but this is the farmer boy's day and the farmer boy's bill and the farmer boy's appropriation at this time, as I understand it.

MR. NICHOLS. I agree with you about that. Would you say that all that would be necessary for a soldier to avail himself of the opportunities in this bill—that all that would be necessary for him to do would be to show his honorable discharge from the Army?

MR. HANSEN. No, sir. Gentlemen, I would sooner you would not question me too strongly on that. I don't know that I am prepared on that line.

MR. NICHOLS. Well, it is very important.

MR. HANSEN. I would not be prepared to go into that closely. I haven't gone into that phase of it. I did prepare a letter, and have submitted it before, that would cover that point, but I don't think it is opportune just now to do that. I made a report on that in writing; but I will say in brief, in answer to that question, that I have already—thinking in my own mind that I might be asked to make an expression on that, I wrote this among other things. This is one clause of my recommendation, and I think a copy of it is on file.

MR. NICHOLS. On file with the committee?

MR. HANSEN. Not on file with this committee. I didn't think it pertained to this, but I think the Secretary—I don't know but

what the Secretary—I know that my own people have it at home. [Reading:]

But, naturally, all can not be considered exactly on the same basis, and classifications must necessarily be adopted, and I suggest possibly three headings, namely:

First. The immediate farm owner and operator.

Second. The project developer.

Third. The educational agricultural employment.

Then I have gone on and specified the three different headings and classified the boys, and that is about all the way I would handle them if they should be brought to me and if I were an examining board or an examining committee. I think for the protection of the boys and for the best interests of all concerned I would necessarily have to make a classification. I could not give the same boy that had been an agriculturist and that was considered a success and had had the experience—I could not give him the same consideration—as another one that had never had any experience on the farm at all, had never been on a farm, but he wants to go on a farm and he would like to go on a farm. I could not put those two fellows side by side and handle them exactly the same way just at the same time.

Mr. MAYS. Have you had any experience in taking city-trained men out onto farms?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; a great deal. So much so that now I won't take a city boy out on the farm until I go right into his own home and get acquainted with his wife. I don't usually loan to single young men; I take married men, and I want to know what kind of a wife he has got, how he is mated up, and whether she is going to be true to the life and whether she is fitted for it and adapted for it, and if she is not, then I don't take them. In my work I only loan 1 out of every 8 or 10 that comes to me, and they don't take any exceptions. At first they did, but I have got my little plans and my own individual way so arranged that I don't have any trouble. I don't want them to go unless they are fitted for it.

Mr. MAYS. After you have selected them, they have been satisfied as a rule?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir; I don't have any trouble with that. Occasionally the best of us will get wrong.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would you recommend that the Government, in putting into operation the provisions of this bill, should go as closely into the conditions of the applicant, the soldier applicant—would you recommend that the Government agents should become acquainted with his wife and his home conditions?

Mr. HANSEN. Not necessarily. That is just my own way. You would have to adopt your own methods as a council of good men, and I would not adopt a plan until I had met in council with the best men that I could possibly get, and I would not suggest that you adopt my plans. These are just personal views, and I realize the danger, and right there is where you are going to have your greatest trouble, if I do say it. I would not want to go on record just now as recommending any one particular measure, because I am not prepared to do so. I have not had to deal with these boys as you will have to deal with them.

Mr. NICHOLS. But you don't believe that an honorable discharge from the Army would be sufficient guaranty that they should be placed on a farm?

Mr. HANSEN. No; if I had to answer that yes or no I would say it was not sufficient guaranty for the maximum amount. Everyone would come under one of these classifications, as near as I could tell.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Hansen, in your summing up that you made—in your statement that you read—I just heard part of it as I came in—regarding the problem, did you mean the problem of developing the land, the land problem, or the soldier problem?

Mr. HANSEN. I don't remember just what sentence you have reference to, but there are both propositions.

Mr. NICHOLS. What problem were you referring to?

Mr. HANSEN. I don't remember the phrase. Can you tell me the thought that I was expressing? Wait just a minute, maybe I did use that.

The CHAIRMAN. You used the word "problem" several times.

Mr. HANSEN. I don't remember it just now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, Mr. Hansen, I will ask you this question: According to the statements that have been made before the committee, probably less than 100,000 of the soldiers who participated in this recent war could, under the authorized appropriation of this bill, take advantage of the opportunities that are offered.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, do you think—if you are considering this as a soldier problem, do you think that the Government should attempt to aid soldiers who were in this war or were in any war to own a home any place, or do you think it should be confined to the farm?

Mr. HANSEN. Absolutely to the farm, without any reservation.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, then, do you believe that the Government should enact legislation, the price of which will be \$500,000,000 to aid only about 100,000 soldiers, when there are 4,500,000 in all?

Mr. HANSEN. I think \$500,000,000 is a very intelligent estimate for the experimental stage of this work.

Mr. NICHOLS. You think it will require more afterwards?

Mr. HANSEN. I think later on you will be glad to give more, if it is carried on successfully.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, how many soldiers do you think will avail themselves of this opportunity? Have you any idea about that?

Mr. HANSEN. I could only judge, as I say, by my own applications. I find when I come to handle them, that a very small amount will go on the farm, and the real purpose of it would be such that the boys would not want to avail themselves—not as many when it gets right down into the detail of it, will want to avail themselves of it just now—not as many as we think. And I think that if more is needed it will be forthcoming. I am not a bit worried about the amount that will be available for the worthy applicants among the soldiers for this purpose, either from the State or otherwise.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Hansen, I come from a city that sent a good many thousand soldiers to the war, the same as other cities of the country did, and supposing the city man, born and bred, we will say, a boy who went into this war, felt that he would like some assistance from the Government to purchase a home in the city; do you think the Government should assist him?

Mr. HANSEN. No, sir; not at this stage. This bill is not intended for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask one or two questions.

If I understand you, I gather from all you say that you give great consideration—now I am asking you from the standpoint of your experience, not what you would do if you were connected with this, but what you are actually doing—I gather from all you say that you give great consideration to the personal equation.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. The personal equation of the individual?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. And I also gather from what you say that you don't take a boy from the city out into the country now—that is, after having had the experience that you have had—that is, not frequently.

Mr. HANSEN. Excuse me, may I make myself a little clearer on that?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I will state the question better. It is hardly well stated. Your position was that you are more successful with a country-raised boy—a boy that is familiar with agricultural conditions in placing them on farms?

Mr. HANSEN. Our conditions possibly want a little explanation there. Most of our boys—many of them—come from the country to the city. They come in and get acquainted and go to schools and colleges, and they get acquainted with the girls and they marry and stay in the city and settle down. They have acquired the art of agriculture; they know how to farm.

Mr. WHITE. Those are the boys that you are talking about?

Mr. HANSEN. Those are the boys that I want back on the farm, whether single or married—those that understand the art of farming.

Mr. WHITE. That is a good answer.

Now I want to ask you another question. I gather from what you say that the experience that a boy gets on a farm, an experience that you yourself know, as well as anyone, that no one can acquire in a week or two or a month or two or a year—in other words, it takes a little brighter man to be a farmer than to do almost anything else in the world; maybe I am a little extravagant there—and that that knowledge, that knowledge of detail, that concrete knowledge acquired in that way, is an equipment that gives him a great advantage and is a greater guarantee of success than would be the case if he did not have that knowledge.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you. I get your idea. I wondered if I got you exactly right.

Is the question of congested city population a serious question in your State?

Mr. HANSEN. It is very serious in the minds of our people, the Mormon people; very serious. The more I come east and the more I have been here on two or three trips lately for different purposes, the more I am appalled at the present conditions as I see them. I am not here long enough to get the condition entirely.

Mr. WHITE. Now, I will ask a hypothetical question—I think it is very fair.

I gathered from all that you said this morning that it is a very desirable thing to get the population onto the farms, to develop our

agriculture; that it is good for the social life of the country. Personally I am in full accord with that idea; and one of the propositions that was brought out in the testimony here has been to get boys back to the farm—that is, to retain more of our agricultural population. I would deduce, if it is a fair deduction—and if it agrees with your analysis of the subject you will not object to saying so—that it would be a sound proposition to keep these boys who are equipped for farming, who have the qualities they have acquired on the farm—I will not mention them, because I like to be brief; you know what they are; we all know what they are, the purpose to win; and that have the knowledge gained by years of experience and the judgment that is its concomitant—I want to ask you if it would not be about the best thing we could do to keep those boys on the farm?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. And you think that for that purpose this bill is admirably adapted, with whatever amendments we might decide to make, for that purpose?

Mr. HANSEN. I do.

Mr. WHITE. And it might be better, and probably more beneficent in its effects in that respect in keeping the good boys on the farm—that is, boys that are equipped and qualified to do this work?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Now, I would like to ask you one more question. Are there numerous opportunities in your State, selective opportunities? What I mean by that is where a young man could, under your advice, and under the advice of his father and mother, buy a small tract of land with good promise of success?

Mr. HANSEN. Very many.

Mr. WHITE. There are a great many?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you. I had one more question—I am somewhat bashful and I don't remember so well what it was, but I want it asked. Well, aren't there a great many cases where a young soldier coming home—this isn't a hypothetical question, it is a fact—I am not here to testify, but I am asking about conditions that necessarily exist in my State of Kansas—I am from Kansas—where apparently this soldier has been unfortunate for a hundred different reasons beyond his control and not necessary to enumerate here—fire, tornado, storm, cyclone, sickness, lack of cattle, plenty of children, and so forth—and he might not be able to start that boy in business. Now, I am going to ask you this question, would it be an advantage to that boy to have the counsel of his father and of his neighbors in making that selection?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. And in your case, in the case of your supervision, I want to ask you one more question—you don't charge anything for this advice—you stated a while ago in substance that your assistance extended from good advice to the loaning of a thousand or two thousand dollars. You don't charge anything for that advice?

Mr. HANSEN. No, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Yet that advice is oftentimes a wonderful asset. We know that about good advice. Good advice is something that a great many persons are addicted to, but it is a good thing to take.

I thank you very much. You have been a very good witness and you have answered my questions very well, and I hope they will all appear in the record.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Hansen, just one question. You have in your work what you call a community settlement, where your people have their schools at a central place and sally forth to work on the farms, do you not, to some extent?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. How does that work? Would you mind explaining about that?

Mr. HANSEN. Will you just repeat that question again, Mr. Mays?

Mr. MAYS. Well, there has been a good deal said here about the community idea of this bill.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. What do you think of the idea as expressed in the bill?

Mr. HANSEN. I think the community idea is a very splendid one—very splendid.

Mr. MAYS. What are some of the advantages of that plan?

Mr. HANSEN. Some of the advantages are these, that instead of allowing them to pick all over the territory and get scattered all over a new country they can be concentrated at one point; the expense of operation, the road expense, the canal expense, and the different expenses are minimized; the advantage of social functions are very materially enhanced, because they can go to school and they can have better schools and more of them, and more and better social functions, and better facilities and advantages in every way. There is a community spirit and cooperation with the people that get close together and understand and organize themselves and put their local leaders where they can do something, and then they get the farm-bureau thought, and they develop and help and strive together and cooperate, and raise, for instance, one particular breed of cattle, and they can specialize on things. They get into a community where they will be known for some particular product, and the buyers come in and they get better prices; and when they ship in they get better rates and every advantage that you could imagine almost. These advantages can be enjoyed rather than to go out and scatter all over and have bad roads and bad ditches and bad fences and bad schools and everything of that kind.

Mr. MAYS. Do you have any trouble with the evils of lonesomeness on the farm?

Mr. HANSEN. No; not so much now. Everybody is working, co-operating in that—the Government, the State, and the communities—and the cooperation on the farm in the last two or three years especially has been marked with wonderful progress; and the whole spirit in the world to-day, so far as I have been able to learn, especially in our western country, is to mutually benefit and help each other on the farm—cooperate and make these functions desirable and intelligent and educational in every way.

Mr. BENHAM. I would like to ask one question: You spoke awhile ago of having spent some time with Director General Davis. You went over quite fully with him the Lane plan, I assume?

Mr. HANSEN. I would not call it fully.

Mr. BENHAM. You spent some time with him?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; I spent some time looking over this plan.

Mr. BENHAM. Were you asked to come here and testify by Mr. Davis or some one else in the Interior Department?

Mr. HANSEN. I don't think that Mr. Davis has any idea that I am on the floor to-day or was invited here.

Mr. BENHAM. Well, then, to put it very briefly, Are you here at the expense of the Government of the United States?

Mr. HANSEN. In no way. I was invited by different State soldier committees and State governors to come, and my expenses will be paid by the State. I dropped everything and came. I said, "If I go, I am going to go and be of true service to my people or to the gentlemen for whom I go." There is no one who has got any strings on me in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. BENHAM. That is all.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Hansen, you partly answered the question that I asked you before, but I would like to get it definitely, and that is this question. This has come up by a number of witnesses that have testified. Do you believe that the provisions—if you have had experience enough to testify along those lines—that the provisions of this bill should be so extended that the individual soldier, wherever he might be, could select a parcel of ground and settle down upon it without following out the provisions of this bill as a community? Do you believe that he could select a farm in Utah or New Jersey or Delaware, or wherever he happens to be, under the same conditions of extending credit as this bill provides for? Do you believe that would be practicable?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes; I believe the intent of this law and this bill is to meet those emergencies where it is necessary. For instance, if a soldier should come back to his home, and his social connections, family ties, etc., are such—his father is overloaded with ground, and he says, "George, I have got too much ground; I am declining a little in years, and I would like to give you 40 acres or 80 acres down on the farm, but I haven't any money to help you out with, and if you could get the Government to, instead of sending you out on one of those new projects, to let you take that and give you a little money to buy some material to build a home and to improve that place and make yourself an honor in our community and"—and to go the old gentleman one better—"I will be very glad to deed you that property," I think the spirit of this bill is intended to take care of that young man.

Mr. HERSMAN. I want to follow that out, because I am very anxious to get your opinion. I know that you have had a lot of experience along this line, and I am anxious to get your view.

You have cited one instance where that should be done. Supposing the young man decided that he wanted to go 2 or 3 miles away where his father did not have any land, in that same country, in that same State, or in that same county; do you believe that the Government should extend the same provisions where it did not have facilities for supervising that particular farm, as it would in the colonization plan? Do you believe the United States Government should give him the same provisions of payment on isolated farms over the country as they would under this bill? That is what I want to arrive at.

Mr. HANSEN. I think so, with conditions of sound financial security familiar to the examining board and the same spirit of helpfulness to that man, and he may be out there alone just now, but if the Government helps him get a little home and helps him get started, it will be inviting for others, and pretty soon, instead of that land being taxed at \$5 an acre, it will be increased in value and will be a source of revenue, and he invites cooperation in that way. I don't think he should be barred because of that. I think the spirit of it is that he would be glad to get your aid.

Mr. HERSMAN. I want to ask you one other question. Don't you think that if the Government extended that privilege to the soldier of making individual selection, that very few would take advantage of the opportunity to get away from their community and go to other larger settlements?

Mr. HANSEN. No; I do not, for this reason, that in going out into these new settlements they are on the ground floor; they are on new, virgin soil, new country, and the very intent of this law is to make it so inviting that the boys won't be forced to go out onto the farms, but they will be invited to come out onto these projects, and that they will gladly go and receive the cooperation of the Government.

Mr. HERSMAN. There is one other question that has been in my mind, and that is this: You have had a long experience in the West and have had experience in seeing men go on farms and seeing their success and their failures. Doesn't their success depend practically upon the first year or two that they farm their land, where they get a good crop? Isn't that true to a large extent?

Mr. HANSEN. It is true to a large extent; but you know out West we have some awful good stickers.

Mr. HERSMAN. I know that is very true; and you have irrigation out in the West, that they don't have in some other places. Now, you represent the church and you extend to these men—if any unforeseen emergency has arisen in those first two years you are prepared to help that man out to the extreme, if he is a worthy man?

Mr. HANSEN. We are very glad to do it.

Mr. HERSMAN. And don't you believe that the Government of the United States should make a provision whereby the young man who has shown an inclination to work on a farm, who will in all likelihood make a success but for unforeseen difficulties that have arisen by reason of loss of crop or sickness that may have overtaken him, and don't you think the United States Government, which was anxious to make a success of these schemes, of this colonization plan, and have the soldier make a success of it—don't you think that they ought to extend him every facility possible to make a success?

Mr. HANSEN. By all means. As I understand it, the whole spirit of the thing is to do that.

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, it was understood that we would try to adjourn punctually at 12 o'clock to-day on account of legislation in the House. Will you be here Saturday, Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. I can be, if it is your pleasure for me to be here.

Mr. NICHOLS. Just one question; it will only take a couple of minutes. I merely wanted to ask what you mean by this segregated

farm proposition—a man buying a farm in any part of the country he desires? Do you mean public land or privately owned land?

Mr. HANSEN. Both.

Mr. NICHOLS. On privately owned land would you help him?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would the Government buy the farm for him?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir; with the Government's interests properly safeguarded.

Mr. NICHOLS. And if it was a \$5,000 farm, would the Government buy it for him?

Mr. HANSEN. If I was going to buy privately owned farms, I don't know that I would go into it quite so much. At the same time, that would be at the discretion of the committee.

Mr. NICHOLS. And then you would make loans to them on the improvements?

Mr. HANSEN. Under the discretion of the commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn now until Saturday morning. Those in favor of the bill will appear then.

Mr. MAYS. There is a little time left for those opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; there is a little time left; and if there is some one here they may use that time.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, the committee adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m. Saturday, June 28, 1919.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, June 28, 1919.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Nicholas J. Sinnott (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, I received a letter this morning from Congressman Hastings, of Oklahoma, in which he transmits to me a bill and statement concerning the same, which he would like to have incorporated in the record. Without objection, that will be done.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1919.

HON. N. J. SINNOTT,

*Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I want to invite attention briefly to the bill introduced by me (H. R. 6043) entitled "A bill to provide homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other purposes."

It contains but four sections.

Section 1 gives the honorably discharged soldier, sailor, or marine a prior right to enter public lands and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior for a period of two years to reserve from entry any part or portion of the public domain as to others. It also permits the Secretary to waive the time limit of residence on said homesteads required of other settlers.

Section 4 gives the short title of the act as the "Soldiers' home act."

Sections 2 and 3 are amendments to sections of the Federal farm-loan act approved July 17, 1916.

Paragraph 5, section 12, of this act only permits loans to be made to the amount of 50 per cent of the value of the land and 20 per cent of the value of the permanent, insured improvements. These loans are made through local

associations. The bill introduced by me provides that loans may be made to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines to the amount of 100 per cent of the appraised value of the land and the permanent, insured improvements thereon; but it divides the amount borrowed into a first and a second loan. The first loan is for 50 per cent of the appraised value of the land and 20 per cent of the appraised value of the permanent, insured improvements and is made in all respects the same as to any other borrower. The second loan that I propose would be up to and not in excess of 100 per cent in the aggregate of the appraised value of the land and the permanent, insured improvements. This second loan is secured by a second mortgage on the land and improvements and is also secured by an assignment of the insurance of the borrower, taken from the Government under the war-risk insurance act and acts amendatory thereof.

Now, as to the first loans, the notes and mortgages are used by the farm-loan banks for the security of the bonds issued, the same as notes and mortgages of other borrowers, but the Government issues its own bonds to supply the money for the second loans secured by the second mortgages and insurance. These bonds shall be denominated "soldiers' bonds." By this plan the Government is insured against loss and the honorably discharged soldier, sailor, or marine wishing to own a farm gets cheap money. He is permitted to borrow it from 5 to 40 years, payable upon the amortization plan, just as other borrowers under the Federal farm-loan act.

In addition, this bill proposes to amend section 15 and permit farm-land banks, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to appoint agents all over the country, through whom applications for loans would be transmitted to the farm-land banks. This would not necessitate the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines joining local farm-loan associations. The plan does not amend the Federal farm-loan act in any other particular, but leaves it in full force and effect. I want to briefly call attention to the advantages contained in this bill.

In the first place, it will enable honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines to borrow money for a long time at a low rate of interest, payable in installments, sufficient in amount to purchase and improve a home. It would permit them to borrow not only 50 per cent of the value of the land and 20 per cent of the value of the improvements, as provided in the farm-loan act, but it would permit them to borrow the full value. It would permit them to look up their own farms, initiate their own transactions, and buy in any locality in any county or State in which they reside or desire to live.

In the second place, it would not require any additional administrative force to carry the act into effect, but the same would be administered by the farm-loan banks and their employees. This would avoid any delays in the act going into practical operation and would insure immediate results. Therefore there would be no additional overhead expense. The first loans will be treated exactly as any other loans. The money to make them will be obtained by the sale of farm-land bonds.

The bill proposed by me provides that the Government shall sell its own bonds to the amount of the second loans and the money derived from the sale of these bonds is to be loaned through the farm-land banks to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. These Government bonds, denominated "soldiers' bonds," are to be nontaxable, just as far as farm-land bank bonds are nontaxable. They are to be sold at not to pay a higher interest rate than 4½ per cent and not below par. The second loan is to be made at the same rate as the first loan and upon the same terms and conditions. This means, of course, that these loans are to be made from 5 to 40 years, payable upon the installment plan, the same as the first loan, but the notes and mortgages for the second loans are not to be used as security for the farm-loan bonds issued, but the proceeds are to be used in the payment of Government bonds.

It will be seen, therefore, that the bill proposed by me will not depreciate the farm-loan bonds, but that the money is loaned direct from the Government on the second-loan notes and mortgages and the soldier's insurance, through the farm-land banks. This will not necessitate another examination of the title or an additional appraisal of the land. In fact, no additional work will be required, because the loan will be made at the same time at which the first loan is made.

The Government will be adequately secured, because, in addition to the second mortgage given to secure the second loan, the soldier, sailor, or marine is required to assign the insurance that he has in force, taken out from the

Government through the war-risk insurance act and acts amendatory thereof. In other words, as additional security, the Government has assigned to it its own insurance.

As the notes secured by the second loans are paid, the proceeds, both principal and interest, are to be applied to the payment and the retirement of the bonds issued and sold by the Government to secure money with which to make these loans. It will be seen that the Government is secured in every respect against loss. These amendments will provide substantial assistance to the men who made large sacrifices and were willing to endure everything in defense of our flag and country.

The returning soldier, appreciative of the merited recognition of a grateful Republic, will take possession of the land purchased for a home, repair, add to, and erect new improvements thereon, as well as clear up and reduce it to a state of cultivation. All this will add greatly to the value of the land. Good agricultural land in my State in the last five years has increased from 50 to 75 per cent in value. Much of it has doubled in value. This is doubtless true of farm land throughout the whole Nation. Every industrious home owner beautifies his home and enhances the value of his land. As the land increases in value and as the loan is reduced by amortized payments, the second mortgage held to pay the Government bonds will become better security.

In addition, the amendment to section 15 provides that a local agent may be appointed through whom these applications may be made for loans, so that the honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines will not have to become members of local farm loan associations. This would insure immediate consideration of the applications and expedite action upon them in every way.

When the original farm loan act was under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee, I was a member of that committee. In the committee and on the floor of the House I criticized the provision requiring that prospective borrowers become members of local farm loan associations before being able to secure loans. I tried to have the same amended when the bill was under consideration in the House. I called attention to the fact then that the organization of local farm loan associations would cause vexatious delays and would have the effect of defeating the purposes of the act. A man can not wait 90 days or longer for the formation of a local association through which to apply for a loan after he purchases a farm. He must know with reasonable certainty immediately, or not later than a week or 10 days. If this amendment is adopted, local associations will not be necessary, but agents would be appointed throughout the country, and applications may be made and forwarded through them to the farm land banks. These agents in a short time will become so proficient that they will see that all the papers necessary to accompany an application are made in due and proper form, and that the abstract accompanying the same is completed, thus avoiding many interminable delays. There is no reason why an application should not receive favorable action within 10 days at most. This amendment should apply to all borrowers, including soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Every other plan that I have heard suggested involves the creation of new bureaus, with a vast army of employees, involving too much overhead expense.

The plan presented in this bill does not involve any additional expense, but uses the machinery of the farm land banks to come to the aid of the defenders of our country. Instead of spending money upon employees, I want to give the benefits to the man who made sacrifices that liberty should not perish throughout the world.

I can not too strongly emphasize the fact that this plan provides money for soldiers, sailors, and marines to purchase land in the locality of their choice and allows them to exercise some judgment in the selection of it. It does not necessitate their leaving the community where their friends and loved ones reside in order to secure a home.

I want also to emphasize the fact that this plan provides cheap money to them. The money can be borrowed from 5 to 40 years upon the amortization plan, providing for the payment of 1 per cent additional annually or one-half per cent semiannually as a payment upon the principal on long-time loans. The returning soldiers of our country are only asking a fair chance, and this plan gives it to them. It enables everyone who desires a tract of farm land to purchase it for a home.

In the long run the Government will not be out anything. The bonds issued by the Government will be repaid out of the collections, principal and interest,

of the second mortgages, and, as additional security for these second loans, the insurance which the soldiers, sailors, and marines have taken out from the Government is assigned. Certainly the Government's own insurance is good security. This insurance must be kept alive and in full force and effect, and this of itself will be helpful in inducing them to keep the insurance in force. In the event of a man's death his wife or other dependents can pay off the loan upon the farm with the insurance and have a home.

In addition to the general legislation enacted for the benefit of men in the service during this war, we have given them a small additional sum to tide them over their period of unemployment. This bill will prove of substantial and lasting benefit to them. It affords the man opportunity to get cheap money, is an inducement to purchase homes, gives them employment, encourages thrift and economy, and will prove of permanent benefit to them. It will aid in the development of our country and show that this Republic is not ungrateful to the men who were willing to sacrifice all in order that liberty might live.

I voted for the declaration of war against Germany. There was no other course to pursue. I voted for all the legislation recommended as necessary and the appropriations asked in order that we might triumph over German military force. From the date of the passage of the resolution, in April, 1917, until the armistice was signed and proclaimed on November 11, 1918, I felt keenly the responsibility laid upon the Representatives of the people of this country. I now feel as keenly the necessity for proper and just recognition of the services of the men who were ready and willing to carry the Stars and Stripes to victory. Their services were invaluable.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any honorably discharged soldier, sailor, or marine who served in the war with Germany, on and after the passage of this act, shall be entitled to enter a tract of public land, under the provisions of the public-land laws applicable to the land entered, and shall further be entitled to make said entry without payment of fees and commission as now provided by law.

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve the entry for a period of two years from the passage of this act any part or portion of the public domain, during which time the said soldiers, sailors, and marines herein mentioned shall have a preference right to enter upon said land: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, is authorized to waive the time limit of residence on said homesteads, as required of other settlers.

Sec. 2. That the fifth paragraph of section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide capital for agricultural development, to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes," approved July 17, 1916, shall be amended so as to read as follows:

"Fifth. No such loan shall exceed 50 per centum of the value of the land mortgaged and 20 per centum of the value of the permanent, insured improvements thereon, said value to be ascertained by appraisal, as provided in section 10 of this act: *Provided*, That loans may be made, as hereinafter provided, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war with Germany, to an amount equaling 100 per centum of the value of the land and permanent, insured improvements thereon: *Provided further*, That the loans shall be divided so that a first mortgage shall be taken upon the land and the improvements in each case to secure the note for a first loan in an amount not to exceed 50 per centum of the value of the land mortgaged and 20 per centum of the value of the permanent, insured improvements thereon, which notes for said amounts may be used by the farm-loan banks as security for the farm-loan bonds, the same as notes made by other borrowers, and a second mortgage shall be taken upon the land and the permanent, insured improvements thereon, to secure a second loan evidenced by a note for the remainder of the loan in each case, in an amount in the aggregate not to exceed 100 per centum of the value of the land and the permanent, insured improvements thereon, which said second mortgages shall be held by the farm-land bank of the district in which the land and improvements so mortgaged are located, and collections shall be made on them, both as to principal and interest, the same as notes secured by first mortgages; and the United States shall issue

its bonds, which shall be denominated 'soldiers' bond,' to such an amount as may be necessary to make the proceeds equal the amount of the second mortgages, which said bonds shall be nontaxable and bear interest at a rate not to exceed 4½ per centum and be sold for not less than par value, and the money shall be loaned to said honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines at the same rate as paid upon the notes secured by the first mortgages, and the proceeds derived from the payment of the notes secured by the second mortgages shall, when collected, be used for the payment and retirement of the Government bonds herein authorized to be issued: *Provided, however*, That said second loan shall be made only to those honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who carry life insurance under the war-risk insurance act approved October 6, 1917, and acts amendatory thereof, in full force and effect, which shall be assigned and held as additional security for said second loan.

"In making said appraisal the value of the land for agricultural purposes shall be the basis of appraisal and the earning power of said land shall be a principal factor.

"A reappraisal may be permitted at any time in the discretion of the Federal land bank, and such additional loan may be granted as such appraisal will warrant under the provisions of this paragraph. Whenever the amount of the loan applied for exceeds the amount that may be loaned under the appraisal as herein limited, such loan may be granted to the amount permitted under the terms of this paragraph without requiring a new application or appraisal."

SEC. 3. That section 15 of said act shall be amended by adding at the end of said section the following paragraph:

"Each farm-land bank in its respective district is authorized to make loans to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines or farm lands through agents appointed by it and approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board, which agents may be other than duly incorporated banks, trust companies, mortgage companies, or savings institutions chartered by the State in which they have their principal office."

SEC. 4. That the short title of this act shall be the "soldiers' home act."

Sincerely, yours,

W. W. HASTINGS.

The CHAIRMAN. I also received this morning a letter from Secretary Wilson, which gives his views about this land legislation. The Secretary writes me that owing to the pressure of departmental work he has been unable to appear before the committee, and he asks me to do him the favor of accepting in lieu of an oral statement the inclosed excerpts from his annual reports, and without objection this will go in at this point.

(The matter referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, June 26, 1919.

HON. N. J. SINNOTT,
*Chairman Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I beg that you and the Committee on Public Lands, of which you are chairman, will pardon the delay in acknowledging your letter of June 10.

Owing to pressure of departmental work I have been unable to suggest a date on which I might avail myself of your courteous invitation to make a statement before your committee regarding the soldiers' land settlement legislation; and I find now that I can not name a date without risk of embarrassing conflict of duties.

Will you not therefore do me the favor of accepting, in lieu of an oral statement, the inclosed excerpts from my annual reports? They express my views on the subject as fully as I could state them in person.

The inclosures are taken from the Third Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor, fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, at pages 41 to 43; and from the Sixth Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, at pages 143 to 146 and 219 to 222.

Trusting that this suggestion may meet with your approval and thanking you in anticipation, I am

Very respectfully, yours,

W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor.

[Inclosure A.]

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

EMPLOYMENT FOR RETURNING SOLDIERS.

The department looks forward to the day when our victorious soldiers will return to their peaceful and customary pursuits and join once more in the up-building through industry of the Nation which they have defended by force of arms. Nor is the department unmindful of the fact that the overwhelming mass of our armies is drawn from the ranks of wage earners, and that when their military task is done these men will return to the ranks of wage earners. It would be an ungrateful Nation, indeed, which did not deem it its first duty to assure to its returned soldiers honorable and profitable employment. It has been the unfortunate experience of the armies of other nations that gratitude has been too frequently confined to words, and men who have risked their lives have too often been released from military life to find an industrial condition where there were more men than opportunities for work. In consequence, such men have frequently submitted to the humiliation of accepting alms.

The department therefore believes that the problem of providing profitable employment for our returned soldiers is its first duty. To believe otherwise would be to violate the spirit of the organic act of the department. "The purpose of the Department of Labor," says this act, "shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

It is in furtherance of this injunction that the department has created and extended the United States Employment Service. The duties of this service, in brief, are to bring together the manless job and the jobless man. It is therefore contemplated to use its full resources in minimizing such unemployment as shall occur. And, indeed, if there were an equality between the numbers of men wishing employment and the opportunities for employment, this liaison would be sufficient. Even in the most prosperous periods, however, there is a disparity between the actual number of wage earners and the number that our industries can absorb. Under the most favorable circumstances this unemployed surplus is such as to give rise to grave social and industrial problems. So long as this basic condition persists, it is apparent that the mere bringing together of men and jobs is not sufficient. In order to provide for this surplus, we must do more than seek for employment among opportunities already existing. We must correct the disparity itself. Consequently, the department faces the further duty of creating new opportunities for employment. In accordance with this view, the department has been for more than three years engaged upon a comprehensive study of the problem of discovering new and profitable opportunities for employment. In the course of its investigations it has availed itself of the expert assistance and advice of many persons in other departments.

Although the war has intensified the basic problem and introduced certain new factors, it has in no essential respect altered any of the chief elements. Consequently, I believe that the plans already formulated will require extension rather than alteration.

Although novel expedients have been suggested, it has seemed best to proceed in accordance with historical precedents and to pursue a course that is justified by our own experience and by that of other nations.

Such experience, as well as the undoubted necessity for a continuous augmentation of the world's food supply for many years to come, indicates that a more extensive as well as a more intensive use of our natural resources must be made. The soil is and must remain the chief working opportunity for large numbers of the Nation's wage earners. It is therefore desirable and imperative that a comprehensive policy with regard to the public domain be established.

The same problem was before us more than a half century ago. Access to the public domain was provided by the homestead law of 1862 and further privileges extended specifically to soldiers in 1872. The results of this policy

were beneficial in that they provided work for unemployed persons, but such benefits were also accompanied by grave evils. Too frequently the efforts of the settler, who was not inured to the hardships of the frontier or familiar with agriculture, resulted in failure. Isolated from his fellows and remote from the advantages of the city, the pioneer achieved only after a long struggle such form of organization as rural life now possesses. Other nations have profited by our bitter experience in this respect and have, in consequence, abandoned homesteading or the method in which the settler is merely provided with a land title and left like Robinson Crusoe to work out his own salvation. For the uncertainties of homesteading there should be substituted an orderly, properly planned scheme of colonization, in which the Federal Government shall establish and equip not only individual farms, but also link them together into organized communities. Rural planning should be brought into play in order to make life in the rural districts attractive and in order to stem the movement from the farms to the cities.

Settlers should likewise be protected from the evils of land speculation. The liberal grants of former years to soldiers were of almost no value to the supposed beneficiaries, because of the speedy transfer to persons who were primarily interested in the resale of such lands at higher prices. Speculation and inflation are evils which it has been found possible to correct in the experience of our associated belligerents. I therefore favor the adoption of some form of tenure which will lay less stress upon titles and more upon actual use by occupants. The absolute tenure does not seem to be well adapted to public colonization, since it is useless to the working settler and attractive to the speculator. There are several other forms of tenure including the perpetual leasehold, better adapted for our purposes.

I therefore recommend the early enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to permit the preparation of the public domain for this purpose. Such legislation should provide for the purchase of such privately owned areas at it may be found desirable to add to the public areas.

Nor should our efforts be considered as limited to agriculture. Great areas are, by reason of natural adaptation, necessarily destined for forest uses. The wasteful methods in vogue in the past in the lumber industry have resulted in the practical destruction of our finest forest areas. The policy has been to treat trees as deposits of wood above the surface and of the same nature as mines, which are deposits of mineral below the surface. These deposits have been destroyed one after the other without regard for the needs of the future. At the same time the industry has been a movable one, operated in the main by men the nature of whose work denies them homes or marriage or even votes. No one who has the interest of America at heart can look forward with tolerance to the growth or continuance of a body of migratory workers who in the nature of the case must have lower social and moral standards than their fellows and a hatred for the law which they have never known except in its repressive aspect. Happily, the possession of the national forests gives us an opportunity to apply the principles of colonization to timberlands also. The substitution of scientific silviculture for timber mining will give us an opportunity to establish permanent forest communities where local self-government, marriage, and education are possible.

In presenting these recommendations at this time, I regard it unnecessary to point out further possibilities, of which the foregoing will serve as an example. In setting forth the necessity for land settlement I am not unmindful of the vast numbers who must again find places in our complex industrial organization. It is too early at present to forecast accurately the industrial organization or needs of our Nation after the war. All the properly adapted facilities of the Department of Labor are at present engaged in the study of those problems of reconstruction peculiar to manufacturing and secondary industry; and from time to time I shall have recommendations and conclusions to present based upon such studies. No such doubt, however, exists with regard to primary industry, and I urge early legislation in accordance with the principles laid down in the foregoing paragraphs.

Legislation upon this important subject should include three minimum provisions: (1) Possibilities of commercialized speculation in titles must be guarded against. (2) Colonists must be given access not only to land but to farms, not the bare soil but fully equipped agricultural plants ready to operate. (3) The farms themselves must be welded together into genuine communities by provision for roads, schools, and markets, under the general supervision of the Federal Government.

The primary principle involved is not the use of men for development of land but the development of land for the use of men. With regard to machinery for putting these provisions into effect, I recommend the organization of a board consisting of the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor for the further organization and supervision of the general plan. Regardless of the machinery by which it is put into operation, whatever legislation is granted should recognize the cardinal principle that the natural resources of the Nation are for the common good of all and should be accessible on such terms as to discourage speculation and exploitation and to reward diligence and thrift.

[Inclosure B.]

MAKING NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT.

In previous reports I have referred to the necessity of extending the labor distribution work of this department further than the bringing together of the "manless job" and the "jobless man." It has been pointed out that this work should cover also the possibilities of creating new opportunities for employment through a suitable development of the country's natural resources. The special need of such a policy in connection with our returning soldiers was emphasized in my report of last year.

As a beginning in the work referred to, and in anticipation of the present emergency, an investigation has been made under the direction of the Assistant Secretary and in cooperation with experts in other departments as to the possibilities in the United States for utilizing land and natural resources for the profitable employment of returned soldiers and other workers. A report has been made on this investigation and a preliminary statement thereon was published last January in the Monthly Review of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The main conclusions of this study, as they bear on the demobilization which now confronts us, are here set forth in brief. They relate to the agricultural, forest, and mineral resources of the country.

Agricultural land.—Agricultural land which is potentially arable but not yet improved is estimated to cover about one-fourth the area of continental United States, or 475,000,000 acres. The development of this huge area will take many years, so there is ample land for any returning soldiers or war workers who may desire employment. But the distribution of this land presents some serious problems. The idle areas are proportionally smaller in the more populous eastern States than in the less populous western States. Four-fifths of the 475,000,000 acres consist of fractional portions of farms already established, the remaining fifth consisting almost wholly of desert, swamp, and cut-over timberlands capable of reclamation. Almost all of this agricultural land is at present in private hands, though some 15,000,000 acres of irrigable desert are still included in the public domain and a few bodies of swamp land remain in State ownership.

Judging from the experience of the Australian and other countries a vast amount of false motion can be saved by the preparation of ready-made farms and through the development of areas by means of the community unit rather than the isolated farm unit. Demonstration farms, run by the State and located at the center of the colonies, form an important feature of the Australian system. On these farms pure-bred cattle and other live stock may be raised and sold at cost to settlers. These farms are used, too, for training new settlers under the direction of an agricultural adviser. This community or colony type of land settlement is being adopted in the reconstruction plans of the British Empire.

Community settlement is well adapted to conditions in the United States: it is being very generally advocated in all sections of the country, and one colony based upon the Australian system has been established on a tract of 6,000 acres of irrigable land in California. This tract was purchased by the State under authority of a law passed in 1917. For the purpose of community settlement it is necessary that the Government, or the States, should reserve or purchase land in fairly large contiguous tracts and under conditions which allow the application of a consistent and systematic settlement policy.

It seems to be common opinion that community life should be required for the returned soldier. He can not be expected to settle down in a needless rural isolation. The soldier settler must be provided with modern facilities for co-

operative effort. These apply to marketing, purchasing, and his other needs. He must be provided also with security in his home and farm. For this reason speculation in land must be eliminated and hence all titles must be dependent upon use. With the land thus made secure for its actual occupant and user, State loans on easy terms made to the settler will prove a real benefit in obtaining initial farm equipment. Such loans should be provided for in the case of each colony.

It goes without saying that no colony should be established on land which can not be profitably farmed. The specific test for such land is the estimated yearly compensation to be obtained by the settler for his own use as a result of his labor. The compensation amounts to the difference between the gross money return and all fixed expenses. The latter include interest and amortization charges for reclamation and improvements, payment of taxes and the use of land, and general running costs. If the compensation over and above these expenses amounts at least to a fair wage, then the labor of farming the land amounts to profitable employment. Otherwise it does not.

Concrete examples illustrating how the Australian methods of community settlement might be applied in this country on some of our undeveloped lands have been worked out in the department's investigation for actual areas in northern Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Forest land.—Forest land presents another fundamental opportunity for profitable employment. Permanent forest areas, outside of farm limits, cover one-fifth of the United States, including the estimated area for farm wood lots, they will cover nearly one-fourth of the country. These lands form the basis not only of logging and sawmilling, but of the manifold woodworking industries as well. But the forest industry, in order to realize its full value as an opportunity for American workers—whether returned soldiers or otherwise—must be handled in accordance with the principles of forestry as against those of old-time lumbering; it must be placed upon a cultural instead of an exploitation basis; timber culture must replace "timber mining."

Lumbering as now generally practiced is a migratory industry; it is therefore a breeder of migratory labor and hoboism. By placing each logging unit under forestry so as to obtain therefrom a continuous timber yield, the lumber camp and the "bunk house" can be converted into a forest community. The woods worker could then have a home as permanent at least as that of his fellow workers in other industries, and the so-called "wobbly" would be in process of extinction.

This change can not, of course, be accomplished all at once. But a beginning can be made in time to benefit soldiers now returning from the war. The opportunity for this beginning is offered in the 150,000,000 acres or more of our national forests. Forest management of the kind required could be carried on in some cases through the present system of "timber sales"; in other cases it has been suggested that the Government conduct its own logging operations. This policy has already been initiated by the United States forest regiments, not only in France but on our own Pacific coast where spruce has been cut for airplane stock. The problems of marketing thus arising would have to be taken up in each case. One important market will consist of the coming needs of the Government itself for vast quantities of timber.

On many of the cut-over bottom lands within the national forests there are opportunities for establishing agricultural community settlements like those which have been described. A concrete illustration of combined farm and forest settlement has been worked out for actual areas in the national forests of western Washington.

Mineral land.—Mineral land which may be utilized as an opportunity for the employment of American soldiers now returning consists for the most part of the coal fields which still remain in the public domain. Some of these are located in the Western States. The most important, however, lie in the Territory of Alaska. These Alaskan fields have been permanently reserved, part of the coal to be mined under a leasing system and part to be retained for Government use. A Government railroad has been built into the Matanuska coal fields, and these under present law can be further developed in a way to set fair labor standards in the mining industry and for those seeking employment in this northern land.

Alaska offers, in addition to her coal resources, what may prove to be one of the best fields of opportunity for Americans of a pioneering spirit. And this spirit will not be absent among the men returning from the front. Some 65,000,000 acres of potential agricultural and grazing land await development

in the several main valleys of the Territory. The Susitna Valley will be opened, probably next year, with the completion of the Government line of railroad from Seward into the interior. In area, latitude, and climate Alaska is comparable with Scandinavia, and almost all of the land to be settled is still in the public domain. An opportunity might therefore be offered our Government in this Territory to establish a modern colonization policy.

The utilization of land herein reviewed involves of course a large amount of work other than that required on the individual farms when once established. These farms would be ready made, but some of the land would require irrigation, drainage, or stump clearing. This sort of work can best be carried on by organized crews. The same holds true for the various kinds of work required in forestry and coal mining. A great deal of preliminary work must be done in all of these industries. But this preliminary work, if properly conducted, can in itself be made to serve as a source of desirable employment for returning soldiers. From this they can be graduated into carefully-selected opportunities upon the very land which they prepare.

[Inclosure C.]

MAKING NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT.

It will not be enough to hunt "manless jobs" for "jobless men." Any efficient public employment service of a national character must go beyond that. Unless it does, "manless jobs" giving out while "jobless men" remain, the causes of involuntary unemployment will continue to express themselves to the great prejudice of the wageworkers of the United States and consequently to the harm of all industrial interests. In my opinion, therefore, the labor-distribution work of this department should extend to some such development of the natural resources of this country as will tend to make opportunities for workers greater than demands for work and to keep them so.

For this purpose further legislation will be necessary. But it need not be either voluminous or revolutionary. Nothing more is required than a judicious utilization of Government lands.

Title to some of the old public domain still remains in the Government. By a recent decision of the Supreme Court Congress is soon to have the power, and to be under an obligation, to treat with landgrant railroads regarding the terms on which large areas of that domain heretofore granted away may be restored. There are extensive areas of privately-owned, but unused farming land, in most or all of the States, which might be acquired by the General Government for promoting labor opportunities as advantageously as other areas have been acquired or retained by it for the creation of public parks. If Congress were to adopt, with reference to those lands, a policy of utilizing them for promoting opportunities for employment, the benefits of the labor-distribution work of this department, and of State and municipal public employment offices throughout the United States, would be vastly augmented.

For such a policy the homestead laws seem to afford a legislative basis and their history to furnish valuable suggestions. Those laws relieved the industrial congestions of their day by opening the West to workers of pioneering spirit who set up individual homes and created independent farms in waste places. But the day of the individual pioneer is over. From the Atlantic he has moved westward until the Pacific throws him back again into crowded spaces, and new forms of industrial congestion have consequently developed. To the relief of these, the old form of homesteading is not adapted; but the homesteading principle persists. The problem is how to adapt that principle to changed circumstances.

One necessary condition is that the General Government shall retain title to the public lands it already holds. Another condition is that from time to time it shall reacquire title to such lands formerly owned by it but now privately owned, as are held out of use and may be reacquired upon reasonable terms. Still another condition is that the Government from time to time shall acquire title to such privately owned lands in different States as may be usefully devoted to the purpose of opening opportunities for employment. All this need not be done at once. A satisfactory beginning may be made with public lands already available for the purpose in question. But it is necessary that the Government shall not lightly divest itself of title to any lands it may set aside for labor opportunities. Regulation of private tenures created pursuant to this pur-

pose should fit the circumstances of particular cases. It is therefore suggested that private titles to lands set aside for the indicated purpose be so adjusted by the Department of Labor to its work of labor distribution as to prevent inflation of land values. This precaution is of extreme importance. Wherever inflation of land values might enter in, the proposed method of promoting labor distribution would be obstructed.

There is still another essential condition. Equipment for farming and education in farming, as well as a place for farming, are needed. All three, however, could be met by an appropriate unification of some of the activities of the Departments of the Interior, of Agriculture, and of Labor. Pursuant to such unification, Congress might provide a "rotary fund" for lending purposes: that is, a fund to be used over and over again for those purposes, and to be maintained by repayments of loans. Out of this fund Congress could authorize the departments named above to make loans, through the Department of Labor, to settlers placed by this department upon lands set aside for that purpose in accordance with the authorized plan for thus augmenting labor opportunities. Those loans could be safeguarded, without commercial collateral, by resting them upon the best possible basis of industrial credit—ability, opportunity, and character—and by establishing in connection with them a system of community credits adapted to the circumstances.

By their educational processes the Departments of the Interior and of Agriculture could make efficient farmers of inexperienced but otherwise competent workers seeking that vocation. By its marketing plans the Department of Agriculture could guard borrowers from the "rotary fund" against commercial misfortune in disposing of their crops. By its labor-distribution functions the Department of Labor could bring the right men to the right places on the soil and settle them there under favorable circumstances. And by their several appropriate functions these three departments, cooperating under appropriate legislation, could multiply demands for labor in rural regions and minimize labor congestion at industrial centers.

It is a reasonable prediction that such a policy would develop in country and city an economically independent and socially progressive population. The results would be analogous in our time to those of the homestead laws at an earlier period.

STATEMENT OF MR. W. R. GREEN, OF BUHL, IDAHO.

The CHAIRMAN. We have with us this morning Mr. Green, a son of Congressman Green, of Iowa, who will favor us with a statement. Will 10 minutes be sufficient time for you, Mr. Green?

MR. GREEN. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You can state who you are and give your views upon the bill. Would you prefer not to have questions asked until you are through with your statement?

MR. GREEN. That is a matter of indifference to me. If it is more convenient for the members to ask questions as I go along it will be entirely satisfactory to me.

My name is W. R. Green, jr., and I reside at Buhl, Idaho. I came out here as the representative of the soldiers and citizens of the county in which I live, Twin Falls County, Idaho. I put in 18 months in the Army, and am thoroughly familiar with the soldiers. I think I know them probably as well as the average man would who had been in for that length of time, due to the fact that I came in contact with more men than the average man who is in the Army would. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that after we all caught our breath after the start of the war the men were wondering what was going to happen to them after they got out, and whether Uncle Sam was going to favor them in any way, and continually I heard talk and discussion of the question of some sort of farms for the returning soldiers.

The western boys were not satisfied with the prospect of homesteads, because they knew, as I knew, that there was very little desirable homestead land left, and they felt that there was not anything left to be had unless the Government took some sort of steps or action to develop lands for them. They felt that the lands were not available and satisfactory under the present conditions. I have had occasion to talk to a great many soldiers lately, not only in my own community but on my way down here I met a number of them, and they are all interested in this. Now, to say that they would all want to take farms would, of course, be too strong a statement, but I mean those who are interested in it. Of course, a lot of them will say, "I have a good job, and I do not care," but a lot of them want a good place to take a home, and they are looking to Congress to provide it for them. They feel that they are entitled to it. Now, you would be surprised to find the number of men out of the cities who by reason of their outdoor life in the Army, and, particularly by reason of the fact that they became familiar with the operation of the pick and shovel, have acquired an inclination for outdoor life, and they want it. They have been taken away from the congested conditions of the cities, and they have been living in the fresh air, and as they come back they find that the congested city conditions pinch them in very much the same way that the English walking shoe does when they first put it on. They do not like it, and they soon begin to feel cramped. There is only one way, and that is to provide farms for them. They will not be satisfied with a cash bonus—or would not after the money has been in their hands for 30 days—and I do not think that anybody after careful consideration would ever favor such a proposition.

Possibly, as the sergeant said here the other day, the Government may owe them a little. I do not know about that, and I do not care to go into that, but those funds will be dissipated just as surely as the world stands. I have known men to draw three months' pay and shoot it away in craps in two hours. I know how these men in the Army spend money, and they are no better now than they were then. They are just the same as they were when they went into the Army and have the same ideas with regard to hanging on to their money. They spend it. Now, to my mind, the Government owes a certain duty to these men besides providing for them cash compensation. These are young men, most of them ranging from 21 to 31 years of age. You have got to take care of them. I am a little over 31 years old myself, and I am a lawyer by profession, but I have a lot of the kid in me yet, and if somebody handed me a big bunch of money I might buy an automobile with it and run it in a ditch, and the game would be over right there. It is true that all of these men, or some of them, have not received the educational advantages that I have had, but, as I have said, if a cash bonus is given them, that money will go. I can not speak of the possibilities of success in other States except my own. I know about Idaho and her irrigation projects, and I know of the success that can be attained there. I know that from personal observation. I have seen men on tracts of land of comparatively small area, ranging from 10 to 30 acres, take from four to five hundred dollars' worth of actual crops per acre.

I know what they do, and I know what the possibilities of success there are. The reason I make that statement is this, that without

doubt there will be a lot of soldiers who would be in favor of selecting farms in their own communities, and who believe that you should back the soldier wherever he wants to go. That is fair. If he can not pick up and leave, put him on a farm at home; but you owe it to the man who is willing to go to provide him with the best public lands that you can obtain under any form of action possible, or I should say public or private lands, but where public lands are open they are the best for the purpose. These lads are no longer tied to their homes, as they were before they went into the Army. They have learned to hold up their heads, and they have met conditions far more difficult to overcome than any they will ever meet on a new piece of land. Pioneering is nothing to them now. I did not go overseas myself, but I know what they met, and I know something of what they met on this side. I know that they will not be afraid. I say to you that if you provide one good tract of land, or one of the very best that this country affords, and will say to the soldiers who want to make homes on it, "This is the best thing we have and the best thing we can find; come upon it," gentlemen, they will come. That is my idea; and then, I say, go ahead and develop that tract.

Do not content yourself with simply putting in a few improvements that will make it possible for a man to go on there, but make it desirable for a man to go on there. Build him roads, build him schoolhouses, and it is a question whether you should build churches, because you get pretty close to him there, but build a community center of some kind and give him a telephone and the things that go to make a place look very desirable and inviting. As soon as you give him a home there he is a good citizen for life. He has no Bolshevistic or anarchistic tendencies and he does not throw bombs. Really that is the serious thing, and if you would get 5,000 men safely planted on farms you would have done a great work, let alone placing 100,000 men on farms.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a son of Congressman Green, of Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you born in Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you leave there?

Mr. GREEN. In 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you read the statement of Judge Boies before this committee?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion of the views of Judge Boies?

Mr. GREEN. To my mind—and I do not speak for anyone else when I express my opinion of the statement made by Judge Boies, and I do not care to be in the position of speaking for anybody in the Iowa delegation—but from my own conversations with members of the Iowa delegation—my opinion is that his statement does not represent the opinion of the Iowa delegation. Further than that, I do not care to go.

Mr. MAYS. Does his statement represent your opinion?

Mr. GREEN. No, sir. I know from my own knowledge of the conditions in the State of Iowa, and I have been back there frequently since 1913, that it is practically impossible for a man to go on an

Iowa farm on a shoe string or with a short supply of cash and ever make his payments. I left Iowa, as did a lot of other people, to go somewhere that offered opportunities to young men, and the biggest portion of the people in my own community in Idaho came from Iowa, Illinois, and Nebraska. They came for the same reason that I did, and in the short space of time that they have been there they have made themselves independently rich, whereas, if they had remained in Iowa and those other States, they probably would have been tenants to-day. I can feel, at least, a little sympathy for the men in Iowa because, I grant you, that it is a painful thing to have your people leaving, but the thing that we are taught to consider is what is the best thing for this country. Iowa is a great and grand State, but she has made her pile. The people there are doing well, and if there is any soldier there who wants to find a home somewhere else there is no reason why he should not go.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to say to you, Mr. Green, that on the Grand Valley project, in Colorado, there is a large delegation from Iowa. They have an Iowa society and an annual Iowa celebration. They are a very fine class of people.

Mr. GREEN. The same thing prevails with us out there in Idaho. There are a lot of them scattered along the Snake River, all the way up and down.

Mr. MAYS. Are you satisfied that the men who have left Iowa and gone out in your present vicinity have done better than they could have done had they remained in the State of Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. I am confident that they have, because most of them came out there with very small capital. They invested what they had largely in improvements, because they were given time in which to pay for their land. They developed lands and they produced wonderful crops. They produced wonderful crops, husbanded their resources, and saved enough money to pay for their land. A good many of them are now hiring a good part of their work done. They have made a lot of money by clean and honest efforts, and in the increase in the value of their property. They bought land at \$25 per acre for the water rights, and, as I recall, 50 cents per acre for the land. The day before I came down here a piece of that land was under discussion in my office. One man said to another, "I want to buy your farm." The other gentleman sitting in the office said, "What will you give me for the farm?" The other replied, "\$450 per acre in cash."

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by saying they paid \$25 per acre for the water right and 50 cents for the land?"

Mr. GREEN. I think that is the provision in reference to Cary Act projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty cents per acre for the land and \$25 per acre for the water rights?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; 50 cents per acre for the land.

Mr. SMITH. What opportunity has a poor young man born and reared on a farm to get a foothold in the State of Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. I should say he had none. I would not attempt to do it if I were a farmer. I have studied farming conditions probably more closely than persons who are not farmers ordinarily do, and I do not believe that would be possible, assuming that he can

not have just unlimited backing and unlimited time in which to pay for his land. I was talking to Mr. Kennedy day before yesterday, and he said that a piece of land down in his part of the State of Iowa had just sold for \$450 per acre. I said, "Do you think that a man could go on land in that community with nothing at all and ever pay for it?" He said, "I do not think it would be possible." And that is true, gentlemen; it can not be done. They have not the productive soil; they have not the initiative, and they are not aggressive enough. They do not farm with the same pep and energy that they have on one of those irrigated tracts. In the case of the irrigation project, the community spirit is there; everybody is striving to get ahead and to have the best farm. The farmer out there wants it said that he has a wonderful-looking farm. It is the spirit of the thing, and they go ahead. It is all new blood, and they are aggressive in that country.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think, then, that Iowa and other Middle Western and Eastern States have not the productive soil that you have in Idaho and farther west, and do you think that this bill will have a tendency to attract soldiers from those other States to the western country?

Mr. GREEN. Not necessarily to the western lands. I prefaced my statement by saying that I was not familiar with the undeveloped lands in other sections of the country. I have been through the South, but I am not familiar with the conditions there; but wherever a man can get cheap and productive lands and the best land, there he will go.

Mr. NICHOLS. You do not think it could be done in Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. It is not at all possible.

Mr. NICHOLS. So that this proposition would have a tendency to induce men or the soldiers to leave Iowa and go there?

Mr. GREEN. I imagine so. There is a State or two through the Middle West that has nothing to offer—absolutely nothing to offer. The people were leaving before the war. They were not soldiers, and they had money.

Mr. NICHOLS. What would you say as to New York State?

Mr. GREEN. I am not sufficiently familiar with the conditions there to speak of that. I have, of course, heard a great deal about the abandoned farms, and I have talked with people who have gone over that situation. I have talked with aggressive farmers who thought it was possible to develop those lands. I have looked over this section of the country; and if somebody will give me a piece of land here, I could make it a go, regardless of the fact that a lot of these people have failed.

Mr. NICHOLS. What do you mean by saying if somebody would give you a piece of that land?

Mr. GREEN. If I could get it in such a way that I could pay for it. That is what I meant.

Mr. NICHOLS. It depends on how much you would have to pay for it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; I could not carry a heavy interest load of 10 per cent.

I believe that is all I have to say. I favor very intensely the Lane bill.

Mr. NICHOLS. The Lane bill?

Mr. GREEN. The Mondell bill or the Lane project.

Mr. NICHOLS. You think that the Government should aid only those soldiers who care to farm?

Mr. GREEN. No, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think they should extend the same sort of assistance and aid to all the soldiers?

Mr. GREEN. To go beyond this plan, I would not attempt; but I feel, as does every soldier, that sooner or later, as the needs become apparent, the Government will help them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think that in addition to this bill the Government will probably offer aid to all the soldiers?

Mr. GREEN. I imagine so. This touches only a few of them. It is one step, to my mind.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, you know that this bill proposes to authorize an appropriation of \$500,000,000?

Mr. GREEN. I understand that; yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think there will be further appropriations?

Mr. GREEN. Without question. Not in a year or two years, but I do not think this work will be over for 40 years.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, you realize that in order to be fair with all of the soldiers that something should be done to assist them if they need assistance or desire assistance?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; I recognize that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Regardless of whether they live in cities or upon farms?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLS. You made the statement that this measure takes care of a very small percentage of them.

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir. I think, however, that it is an admirable measure, because it takes care of those few, and I think that will work greater good to the country at large than any other assistance that can be offered to the soldier.

Mr. NICHOLS. If you take this cost of \$500,000,000 to take care of 100,000 of them, at the same rate, how much would it cost the country to take care of all of them?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think your hypothesis is sound, for this reason, that we are working upon the assumption that a goodly portion of this money will be returned to the Government. You are simply lending credit to these men, if your organization is sound.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, of course, that would be true, no matter how great the appropriation that was desired. That would be true if you should lend money to the city soldier to place him in a home in the city.

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; the proposition is the same. You simply advance them the wherewithal that they can not get in any other way in order to safely establish them in homes.

Mr. BENHAM. You expressed very grave doubts as to the possibility of a man who has not the price of an Iowa farm ever being able to acquire an Iowa farm. Now, looking forward to the future of your native State for another generation, what, in your opinion, would be expected to happen in that State, say, 30 years from now when the present owners have passed away? What is likely to be true in regard to citizenship, etc., in Iowa, in another generation?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know that I catch your idea, but my observation is that a great number of farms are handed down from generation to generation in the State of Iowa—that is, directly from the farmers themselves and from landowning city people.

Mr. BENHAM. You get my question only in part. Now, let us assume that the average farm family in Iowa would consist of four persons, and that is a fair assumption, possibly. The Iowa farm of average size could not well supply a farm to each of the four members of the family, but we will assume that one of those members inherited enough from his father to pay for one-fourth of a farm, or one-fourth of a farm similar in value to that of his father. Now, as I understand it, you say that it would be impossible for that member of the family to ever pay for a farm equal to that of his father?

Mr. GREEN. I would not say that it would be an impossible thing.

Mr. BENHAM. "Practically impossible," I believe was the term you used.

Mr. GREEN. You have got to classify the man who is doing the job. It is not fair to say that the men who go on those farms are above the average. They may be supermen in some respects, but they are average men in others. You can not say that the young man who undertakes this is a wizard at farming or that he has remarkable executive and financial ability, but if he has not those qualities, he can not do that, unless he has got a father who will back him to the limit and will carry him from one year to another, giving him advice and every aid and assistance that a father can give his son, including stocking the farm, buying the automobile, and building the house.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would you regard that father's advice and assistance of any considerable value to a young man starting into the farming or in any other line of business?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, and no; and I want to explain what I mean. A father's advice is always valuable, without question, but to say that a father's advice on farming is better than the advice of some younger men is a serious question. My observation has led me to believe that lads from Iowa who went to Ames, that wonderful agricultural school they have there, where they have taken the farms over and have handled the farms, are making them more productive than their fathers did. In other words, father's advice has to be overruled on some questions sometimes.

Mr. BENHAM. Pursuing that thought a little further, I assume from a remark that you made just when I came into the room that you have the impression that possibly some members of this committee would desire to tie down the soldiers to their various communities. Is it your impression that it is the view of some members of the committee that they would object to a man going to Idaho if he desired to do so?

Mr. GREEN. I am not sufficiently familiar with the attitude of the committee to indicate, but I know that that impression or that idea prevails in the minds of some men in Congress. I know that they have the view that the men should not leave their home States.

Mr. BENHAM. Putting it another way, would you say that before he gets any assistance he must leave his home State?

Mr. GREEN. No, sir.

Mr. BENHAM. I understood you to say that there are probably several States in the Middle West that could not provide lands for

a project. Now, would you say that if there is a young man in one of those States who desires governmental aid he shall leave such State; that is, that he shall leave Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, or Indiana?

Mr. GREEN. By governmental aid, do you mean assistance in procuring agricultural lands?

Mr. BENHAM. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I would say that if you could handle this proposition just as a banker who makes loans to men would handle it, then, as a practical question, that is not serious. If you used the same cold-blooded judgment in determining whether or not it is possible for a young soldier in Iowa to buy \$200, \$250, or \$300 land, that would not disturb you much as a practical question. You must be cold-blooded in this matter if it is to be a revolving fund. You must use the same business judgment and acumen that a banker does when he makes a loan. If it can be done, give it to him.

Mr. BENHAM. Of course, you would safeguard the loan which the Government would advance wherever the soldier was located? If he settled in your own State, or in your present State, or in Iowa, you would have the loan safeguarded in the same way?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. BENHAM. In the case of a young man who has little or nothing in the way of meeting an advance payment, where would you say it would be easiest for him to get backing on ordinary bankers' collateral, if that is what the Government would require of him? Would it be easier for him to get that backing in his home community where he is known or 1,000 miles away from home among strangers?

Mr. GREEN. I should say that if he is entitled to credit, his home banker will carry him in South America.

Mr. BENHAM. Would you as willingly back a man of your acquaintance in South America as you would where you could see him and consult with him frequently?

Mr. GREEN. I probably exaggerated the situation somewhat, but knowing the conditions in my home community as I do know them an Iowa banker would prefer to lend money to a man out there to get an irrigated farm in Idaho, because the opportunities for success are a thousandfold greater.

Mr. BENHAM. Of course, we have heard many times, and I have no doubt it is true, that there are wonderful opportunities for a limited number of men in Idaho. It is a limited number, and, as I understand it, a decidedly limited number.

The CHAIRMAN. In Iowa?

Mr. BENHAM. In Idaho. The opportunities there are for a decidedly limited number. But, taking the general proposition, and speaking from the standpoint of a lender of money, is that contention of any value? What I mean is this: I myself have invested in quite a good many pieces of land, and I have found from years of experience that it makes a vast amount of difference whether a man is in the home community where I can see him and consult with him. Have you had any practical experience along similar lines?

Mr. GREEN. No, sir; I can not say that I have. I am rather a borrower than a lender.

The CHAIRMAN. You might explain your plan.

Mr. BENHAM. When you have had some experience along that line you will not be enthusiastic about wanting to back the young man away from home—that is, if your experience should be what mine has been.

Mr. GREEN. I do know this, that many hundreds of thousands of dollars of Iowa capital has been sent out to be loaned in the State of Idaho. I know that those people back there are glad to send that money to us.

Mr. BENHAM. As I understand it, that is at a rate of interest that is fairly high. I do not know that anything would be gained by pursuing this any further, but what I say is based upon personal information that I have gathered after several years spent in what I am pleased to call a reclamation service. I buy farms that in the course of five years I can reclaim in the sense in which I use the term, and I insist that I can reclaim them by giving them personal attention and by applying personal methods of my own instead of governmental methods—more cheaply than the Government. I insist that I can improve those farms more cheaply than the Government could do it, and I insist that I or any other individual can afford to sell those farms to the individual so as to make it easier for him to pay the interest than can the Government.

Mr. GREEN. I do not think your proposition is sound, and I will tell you why: You have not got a farm—I do not care where you go—that is equal to the farms in my community. I am basing that statement on my own knowledge of farming conditions through the Middle West, where they doubtless have wonderful farms. I do not know where you come from, but I know what the crop production is, and I know what the cost of production is.

Mr. BENHAM. That is one question—

Mr. GREEN (interposing). That determines the advantage that the man who goes on the land will have.

Mr. BENHAM. You refer to the objection of the Middle West, and you western people seem to assume that the farmer boys are all going to Idaho.

Mr. GREEN. No, sir; they are not.

Mr. BENHAM. I assume that there are wonderful possibilities for a limited number in your State. I say that not only from what I know of it, but from what other persons, or my former neighbors, have told me, and I believe that is true; but at the same time there is a vastly greater number of men to be helped than can be helped in your State. I might say, in brief, that in the community where I live I have a farm worth \$8,000 that I offered recently to a man whom I very much admire. I said to him, "You go and crop 20 acres of that 165 acres and give me that one crop and I will make you a deed to the farm." He would have 145 acres for that season and the whole farm or the use of the whole farm later on. I know that is a good thing and I know that there are not many propositions in the country that are superior. As a general proposition I know that I, or any other energetic individual, can place a man on a farm more cheaply than the United States Government will. Putting it in another way, you know, I assume, that there are farms in Iowa, New York, and Indiana where the improvements have been made on the basis of \$1 per day labor or \$2 per day labor, and the men performed labor

in the way they did years ago and not as men labor for the Government nowadays. Those improvements have been made vastly cheaper than the Government of the United States under this Lane bill or Mondell bill will make improvements.

Mr. GREEN. That may be true, and bearing that out, in talking with Mr. Kennedy the other day, he said that when he first came to his part of the country a man took him out a little ways and showed him a good farm, with wonderful improvements upon it. He said that the house and barns and other improvements were valued at \$8,000, but the man offered it to him for \$3,000. Yet he did not buy it.

Mr. BENHAM. According to the testimony before this committee it is evidently true that there are vast numbers of farms in the United States on which the buildings are in fair condition and the farms themselves are good, but they have been practically abandoned for various reasons. Another thing I am trying to draw out in this long series of rambling questions is this, Is there any good reason why it would be more dangerous for the Government to back up a boy or give him a low rate of interest on one of these segregated projects in the State of New York, along the Hudson River, where he can buy a farm, as the evidence before this committee shows, for the present value of the improvements, than on a Government project? Is it any more dangerous for the Government to back up a boy on that sort of farm, or segregated farm, than it would be to back him up on one of those Government projects?

Mr. GREEN. In answer to your question, I will say this, that if the man you put on this segregated tract in the State of New York is a thoroughly trained farmer, familiar with all the things that are necessary to develop that piece of land, and if he has the benefit of expert advice—

Mr. BENHAM (interposing). With his father's advice.

Mr. GREEN. Not father's advice, but the advice of an agricultural expert, because father has not made any great showing there, or the land would have increased in value.

Mr. BENHAM. It is not, nevertheless—

Mr. GREEN (interposing). Let me finish that statement, please. If he is a man of tremendous energy, or if you could find a man who possesses the qualifications and advantages I have named, then I say that he will do just as well, and probably better, but of those things are not available, then I say that where the men can be collected closely together, or where the element of competition enters into it, and where the opportunity to observe is good, and where you have trained experts to advise those men, then there is a greater opportunity. I say that because if he does not know, he has got to learn. Then, how will he learn? His father can not give him advice, because his father will be in practically the same condition that he will be in, or, otherwise, the land values there would be up, and people would be there in great numbers farming.

Mr. BENHAM. You are doubtless familiar with the fact that practically all of the Northern States—I do not know about the South—have in each county an agricultural expert.

Mr. GREEN. I believe that is true.

Mr. BENHAM. When he is furnished by a college of his own State, he is probably better qualified to give advice about conditions in that

State than a man who was sent from Washington would be. Would it not seem that a man who has been trained in the agricultural college of the State where he is serving, and who knows the farming conditions in the State, would be, at least, as competent as some man sent by Secretary Lane to be the guardian of the boys on the project?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely; but let me ask you, do they have them in New York State upon the farms?

Mr. BENHAM. I can not say for New York State. The gentleman representing New York State, I think, is not here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. If I remember correctly the New York State Bulletin says that about half of the counties have them, although I am not positive about that.

Mr. BENHAM. Speaking for my own State, I thoroughly believe that we have as good an agricultural college as the country—or world, for that matter—has in it; but speaking of the man in my own county, the gentleman selected last year for my county was not reemployed for this present year or for this coming year. We observed that when he came to that county he employed a stenographer under political advice, and he stayed in his office. While I was at the county seat probably three times a week, he had been there nine months before I ever met him. It seemed that he was stationed there simply to draw his salary and provide a place for the stenographer; hence, in the judgment of those who had the selection, he was not reemployed. Now, one of the representatives of the Interior Department, in testifying before the committee, practically put it this way: "Put the men on our projects and we will practically guarantee 100 per cent success." Is it not possible that many of those projects would have upon them energetic and competent men who had been trained by State agricultural schools; and is it not possible that you might have just as efficient men on your reclamation projects, where the matter would be vastly more vital than on the segregated farms—is it not entirely possible to have such energetic and competent men, and yet, as a matter of fact, might we not expect to have there a number of overseers selected here in Washington?

Mr. GREEN. In other words, your question is, Is there any distinction between the agricultural expert who might be selected here and the one who might be selected in your county? I say there is just as good opportunity to select a good man from one place as the other. Possibly the Government has better facilities and opportunities for making the selection and a greater territory to draw from. In other words, it is entirely possible to get as good a man in one place as another.

Mr. BENHAM. Putting it another way, our own agricultural college is much older, and it has had a much longer time to develop experience than has the Interior Department. Now, I will pursue that question a moment further, and then I will desist: Assuming that there would be such a policy, and we know there are many good schools that can guarantee that the man sent out will be a large success in any line, as I understand it, the success or failure of your reclamation project would depend vastly more upon the efficiency of the overseer or adviser than would be the case on the segregated farm, where the young man is surrounded by those who are capable of advising him.

Mr. GREEN. That is wrong, because from my observation of the matter, if one man follows the direction of your supervisor, as he should be designated, and his efforts are not successful, all of them immediately know about it. You could not get a project in my home State and fill it up with men from this section of the country. They will not let you do that; but they would be going on the project with men who had been thoroughly trained from childhood, and they will not follow the advice of the supervisor who is absolutely wrong. If that should happen, they would soon sound the alarm.

Mr. BENHAM. I promised not to ask any further question; but I do not quite understand one statement you have made. You assume in one case, or in the case of the segregated project, that the man must necessarily be ignorant, while you say that the man on your project would have been trained from childhood.

Mr. GREEN. Let us say that one-half of them know their business and that the other half do not, or let us assume that one-fourth of them know their business and that the other three-fourths do not. The one-fourth on the irrigation project who know their business, will furnish advice and information to the other three-fourths. You have them scattered all over the project.

Mr. BENHAM. As I understand it, in a general way, you have talked to a lot of sailor boys, and I want to ask you what their attitude would probably be toward a Government overseer, whether he is a major or a colonel or whether he is some other representative of the Government. At the present time you know the state of mind of the average soldier, and what it might be toward a Government boss on a project.

Mr. GREEN. Do not call him an Army officer who would be over the men. You would not get away with anything like that; but as for a man in that position, let him be the daddy of the outfit. Such a thing is possible, and it is practical in its operation. They are doing it out there on our projects. They have an agricultural expert there who is thoroughly well trained and familiar with that work. He does not come out and nag you to death by telling you to do this, that, or the other thing, but they go to him and ask for what they want.

Mr. BENHAM. That is assuming that there are no such things as inefficient overseers on reclamation projects.

Mr. GREEN. No, sir; they are human, and they fail just as people fail in other branches of life.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask Mr. Benham a question: Are your reclamation operations confined to the one county where you live?

Mr. BENHAM. Yes; or in my own community. Let me give one illustration of that, if it is proper to detain this witness. I am experimenting at the present time with a man who is 57 years old, and, who, up to 55 years of age, had not accumulated a dollar. At 55 he asked to go on a farm of mine. He did well, and surprised me and the neighbors by doing well, and he has probably made about one-third enough to pay for the farm in question. Of course, the natural corollary was to be asked about the purchase of the farm. Believing that even at that age it would be possible for him to succeed, I told him to put his profits in implements, to supply himself with stock, and to buy the farm and pay for it as he could,

paying an amount for the rent each year. Now, I am thoroughly satisfied that after five years he will have a farm that will be a source of income to him in his old age. Taking a case like that, success is only possible for individuals who know the conditions. It would not be possible for Secretary Lane, or any other power 1,000 miles away, to take a case like that.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been operating that way?

Mr. BENHAM. Twelve years.

The CHAIRMAN. How many individual experiences have you had?

Mr. BENHAM. It might be just as well to give me 20 minutes or half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. I think your experience would be valuable to the committee.

Mr. MAYS. Do you sell land upon as liberal terms as this bill provides?

Mr. BENHAM. Yes; but I am using 6 per cent money, and I can not give the boys 4 per cent money.

Mr. MAYS. Do you object to this bill because it gives money at 4 per cent?

Mr. BENHAM. No; I certainly do not.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do not sell on 40 years' time?

Mr. BENHAM. I would if it were necessary.

Mr. MAYS. I want to ask Mr. Green one question. Mr. Green, you are a son of Congressman W. R. Green, of Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. You left Iowa and went to Idaho?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Was your father a Member of Congress at that time?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. Suppose, in addition to being a Member of Congress, he was engaged in reclaiming lands in his immediate vicinity and selling to the people there and charging them 6 per cent interest, would you thing that this bill would be a hardship upon him and take away from him some of the customers that might come to him if the bill should not be put into operation?

Mr. GREEN. I hope not.

Mr. MAYS. You think there would still be left plenty of prospective purchasers for your father in Iowa?

Mr. GREEN. They have no difficulty in selling their land back there, and they are changing hands remarkably fast.

Mr. MAYS. Even though it should enter into competition with your father, you would still be in favor of the bill?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; certainly. He does not fear it.

Mr. NICHOLS. In your opinion, this measure will not offer any aid to any soldier who went to war from the State of Iowa unless he desires to leave that State and go to some other?

Mr. GREEN. I wouldn't got that far, but I do say that as a practical proposition it won't help very many of them. Now, if you will apply the cold analysis of the banker in determining whether or not the soldier who proposes to take over a piece of Iowa land under this plan—if you will analyze the situation just as a cold-blooded banker would do, if he can handle it, then all right, give it to him. I don't think he can. I know that his judgment is not good if he

tries it, unless he is forced to stay in the State of Iowa for some reason and can't get out to a hundred other places in the United States.

Mr. NICHOLS. You naturally think there would be a preference for some other State?

Mr. GREEN. I absolutely do.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Green, it is all right for the Iowa boy who inherits a farm, or one who can marry a girl that has inherited the farm, but if he is the son of a poor man, a tenant, or has no wife who inherits an estate, your judgment is that there is no way that he can acquire a farm that at all compares with the Government opportunity of giving him 4 per cent and 40 years' time?

Mr. GREEN. That is true.

Mr. TAYLOR. And for that reason it is such an uphill proposition for a poor boy to ever get a piece of ground that costs \$400 an acre that it is almost prohibitive.

Mr. GREEN. He would much prefer to go somewhere else or stay in the city.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he can't put in his whole life trying to get title to 20 acres, possibly, in a State of that kind, where he could go out and in three or four or five years acquire a home, a farm, in a new country.

Mr. GREEN. And of equal productivity and yielding an equal return.

Mr. TAYLOR. You feel that instead of that being a hardship upon him, it would not only be a great benefit to him, but a benefit for the country for him to go out and take that chance?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; and in three years he would have a piece of land that would rent, in cash, if he came from some sections of the country, at least from \$20 to \$40 an acre. I have handled in the last year a number of leases where men are paying \$45 an acre in cash for the use of tracts of land varying from 10 to 40 acres.

Mr. MAYS. More than the land originally cost, was it not?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYS. How long ago was it purchased at the price you mentioned awhile ago?

Mr. GREEN. I should imagine—well, I don't know. It was in 1909 and 1910, I think.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. All of that was along in 1905 and 1906.

Mr. MAYS. And it was then purchased for \$25 per acre?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir. It was not developed within that time, however.

Mr. BENHAM. Just one question, suggested by Mr. Taylor—there is a possibility that a circumstance like this might happen: Here are two soldier boys, sons of the same father, from your native State of Iowa. The one decides that he would like to buy his father's farm. Let us suppose that the boys each have \$5,000. The father's farm could be bought for \$7,500. The other boy, who has his \$5,000, would prefer to follow your example and go to Idaho. Now, that boy goes to Idaho and settles on a project. According to the Lane bill, he would have assistance offered him; he would be loaned money, let us say \$2,000—I don't know what the figures now are—and he would be given 40 years in which to pay that back at a low rate of interest. The boy who stayed on the father's home farm, he also wants to

borrow \$2,500 or \$2,000, or whatever the case may be. He is also a soldier. Would you say to the boy who wants to go to your present State: "I am in favor of backing you, giving you governmental aid," but to the boy who wants to settle on his father's farm, "We can't do anything for you?"

Mr. GREEN. No; but again your hypothesis is not sound, for this reason—

Mr. BENHAM (interposing). Why not? Show me.

Mr. GREEN. That there is no land that amounts to anything in the State of Iowa that can be bought for the figure you name.

Mr. BENHAM. Suppose \$100,000 then.

Mr. GREEN. In the next place, if he has got the \$5,000, he can go down to the Federal loan bank and get his money at a very nice rate of interest with fine terms of payment, and he doesn't need any particular help from the Government.

Mr. BENHAM. Can't the boy who joins your project go to the land bank also, or to private banks, and get the money? In short, why make a difference? Why say to the boy who wants to stay at home: "You can't get a cent." But to the fellow, it doesn't make any difference what his circumstances are, who wants to go away: "We will help you"?

Mr. GREEN. Did I say that?

Mr. BENHAM. Your answers to the last question would imply that.

Mr. GREEN. No; I said if he could stand the cold analysis of the banker on his application for a loan, give it to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we have Gov. Spry with us this morning.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, before you take that up, may I present a matter to the committee which is very urgent?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to present a matter to the committee this morning—it will not take me but a moment—and I would like to get the action of the committee on it.

There are two contending parties—

Mr. SMITH of Idaho (interposing). Does it pertain to this bill?

Mr. RAKER. Well, that is for the committee to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. This is on your own time.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; this is a matter that I am bringing as a Representative to the committee for their action, so that I may answer my constituents. There are two contending parties, one in favor of constructing a project and the other is opposing it. They have had the view that this bill is for the purpose of this particular project, and have been advised that that is the fact. I have telegraphed them that it is not the fact; that this bill is general in its character and relates to no special project. They want to know the status of the bill and want me to ask that the committee hold up the bill, the consideration by the committee—final consideration and hearings—until their committee can come to Washington and be heard upon this special project. And I may say this, that I saw the Secretary this morning and showed him my telegrams pro and con; I also saw Director Davis, and he says that this bill does not involve any special project; that none have been considered by them, that none are under investigation by them as special projects, and that it is entirely up to the department to determine what will be done after

the legislation is enacted. But in consideration of my duty to myself and to my constituents, I present this matter this morning and ask that the representatives may have an opportunity to be heard, and the hearings be continued until they have that right in regard to this special project.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask Mr. Raker a question. When you use the words "special projects," Mr. Raker, do you qualify those words in the least? Do you mean projects of a designated character, or do you mean individual designated projects?

Mr. RAKER. I mean individual designated projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Judge, you know, and they ought to know as well as any member of this committee, that this bill does not take up any particular projects. That is left to a selection hereafter.

Mr. RAKER. I do, Mr. Chairman, know it specifically and distinctly, but there have been telegrams sent and the impression is that this bill is the purpose of an individual project.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I never heard of that before.

Mr. VAILE. Won't Congress have to act on any particular designated project?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Judge, you know it is not the function of this committee to take up individual projects. It is absolutely not within our province to take any evidence in connection with any particular project.

Mr. VAILE. These gentlemen can have an opportunity to be heard on any particular designated project when it comes before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. Why can't Judge Raker give them the information they want?

The CHAIRMAN. I think Judge Raker is authorized to give them the information on behalf of this committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it might be well, in order to satisfy those people, for the chairman of this committee to send also a telegram to these parties, saying that there are no—that there can be no special project selected yet, and not only that, but the committee would have no authority to consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. I would be glad to cooperate with Judge Raker in conveying to them the information, and obviate the necessity of their coming on here.

Mr. TAYLOR. And, incidentally, the hearings are closed.

Mr. NICHOLS. Judge Raker, who are these telegrams from? Are they from soldiers?

Mr. RAKER. No; these are from—one is from Charles L. Hampton, president of the board of directors of the Anderson-Cottonwood irrigation project, whom I know very well. Another is from an old friend of mine—

Mr. SMITH of Idaho (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I have had at least a score of inquiries from people interested in individual projects, and I have told them all that it is a matter this committee has nothing to do with.

Mr. RAKER. One is from Capt. Dozier, commander of the Shasta County Service Men's Association. Another one is from the Northern California Counties' Association, consisting of five counties. Another one is from Mr. Francis Carr, of Reading, whom I have known

for many years. Another one is from Julius Alexander and Russell Brownell, of Susanville, whom I have known—I have known Mr. Alexander for 35 years. They have been advised that the bill—my bill, which is the same as the rest—carries a special appropriation for a particular project, and they want to send representatives here to speak upon it. I have told them that this committee has not considered any individual projects and would not do so, but notwithstanding that, as their Representative, I make the request of the committee this morning and submit the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the chairman will be glad to cooperate with you in wiring to those gentlemen.

Mr. RAKER. You will not hear them?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did you make a motion that they be heard?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I will make a motion that they be heard.

Mr. BENHAM. It might be of interest to the committee, Judge, to in a general way let us understand who it is that is in favor and who it is that is opposed to the project.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think it is necessary for this committee to go into the matter of who is opposed to those projects there and who is supporting them. We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is, not in opposition to this general proposition but is in opposition to some other project.

The CHAIRMAN. It has nothing to do with this bill. The only matter that you are concerned in is to quiet the apprehensions of those people that we are going to take up some particular project in this committee?

Mr. RAKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Which we are not going to do.

Mr. MAYS. I think he has already quieted them by telegraphing them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Are they representing soldiers or private parties?

Mr. RAKER. This is solely a matter of irrigation, a particular project, known as the Iron Canyon project in northern California. One county and the people below are in favor of it; the county above and five additional counties are opposed to it. It is in my district and I propose to act as their Representative in Congress, and when either side desires to be heard, I am always ready to present it, but shall not take the attitude of an advocate on either side, and I present it to the committee now at their request.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You have presented it to the wrong committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. That should go to the Appropriations Committee some time. That is where that will go.

Mr. VAILE. Let them be heard by the Appropriations Committee then.

Mr. NICHOLS. Has this project you speak of anything to do with this bill?

Mr. RAKER. I don't think so, to be honest with you.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, these fellows are a little bit worried, aren't they?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are worried about some other fellows getting a project instead of them.

Mr. WHITE. Why wouldn't it be a good plan to inform them that this committee is considering general legislation and not any special projects?

Mr. RAKER. What is the action of the committee now, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to cooperate with you in wiring to those people that it is not necessary for them to be heard.

Mr. NICHOLS. I will support your motion, Judge Raker, if you make the motion.

Mr. RAKER. I take it that the committee would not hear them if they came?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes—well, I wouldn't put it that way; but there is no necessity for them to come on relative to this specific project.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. White hits the nail on the head. We are not considering projects; we are considering legislation and not individual projects.

Mr. FERRIS. Why not let the record show that Judge Raker presented their request faithfully and fully, the committee faithfully and fully considered it, and the consideration resulted in the decision that we are in nowise concerned in individual projects, and in nowise prejudiced that case.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the record shows that.

Mr. FERRIS. And that that is the judgment of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. That will be the judgment of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be the judgment of the committee, without objection.

Now we will hear you, Gov. Spry. Please state your name and residence.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM SPRY, OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Mr. SPRY. Mr. Chairman, since coming into the room I was handed this letter by Representative Hays, he having received it for me from Mr. Meehan, who was here two days ago, desirous of appearing before the committee. I might say that Mr. Meehan entered the service as an enlisted man—the Naval Aviation Corps—and he was mustered out as an ensign, and he has expressed his views upon the bill which you are considering now, and I would ask if there is any objection to having it go into the record as the presentation of Mr. Meehan's views?

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Meehan was here present for two or three days wanting to be heard and he had to leave.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter will be placed in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

NEW YORK, N. Y.,
June 27, 1919.

HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I regret that business in New York compelled me to leave Washington before I had an opportunity to appear before the committee in support of the Mondell soldier settlement bill. For two days during the past week, after hearings were reopened, I listened with keen interest to the testi-

mony given, and since coming East I have carefully read the first two installments of the printed testimony.

May I state that I am chairman of the soldier settlement committee of the Utah Chapter of the American Legion; that I was a delegate from Utah—elected by the service men—to the national caucus of the Legion which was held in St. Louis in May of this year; that while there I was appointed the western member of a committee of seven which is in charge of the launching of the publication of the American Legion Weekly, which is to be the official organ of the Legion and which will begin publication early next month.

My service during the war was in the Naval Aviation branch, in which I enrolled as a second-class seaman, and rose to the rank of ensign. I volunteered for this service in August, 1917, and was accepted and enrolled in September, 1917. I saw service from Boston to Miami, Fla., in this country, and was in Scotland, England, France, and Belgium during my overseas service. Practically half of the time that I was in service I was in the enlisted personnel and the other half an officer, so I believe I can say I had an opportunity to know something of the feelings and opinions and sentiments of both classes of men. Having been a newspaper man in civilian life, I had the advantage of being something of a trained observer of men and opinions, as well.

Ever since there began discussions of the possibility of soldier-settlement legislation I have taken a keen interest in it. Two years of my life I spent on a western irrigation project, and my subsequent newspaper work in the West kept me in constant touch with such development. I believed in soldier-settlement legislation as a splendid opportunity for men who had been in service to become real home and land owners, and I am firmly of the opinion that no one piece of reconstruction legislation means so much to the Nation and to the soldier as does the one you now have under consideration.

Studying the testimony given before your committee, I conclude that in the minds of some Members there is a question of how best to do something for the largest number of men who saw service in the European war. That is natural and praiseworthy. But may I suggest to the committee that there were in the service thousands of men who do not require and who do not seek to have anything done for them? There were millionaires and men of large and moderate means, men who had their own businesses and professions and trades, to which they will return, and the experiences which they have had in service will so broaden and strengthen them that their recompense will come in the ability to think better and live better and work better because of the privilege or service to their Nation which they had the honor of performing.

On the other hand, every man who was in service sincerely desires that the soldier and the sailor shall have an opportunity of becoming a substantial, independent citizen. To thousands of those who seek bigger and broader fields than those in which they were active previous to the war the soldier-settlement project offers an attractive opportunity. I do not believe that the average ex-service man seeks or wants a gift—he wants an opportunity. He believes his Government should give it to him or to his comrades. If he sincerely and earnestly desires an opportunity, one requiring the use and development of his own initiative and ability, he could have it through the soldier-settlement plan. By 5 or 10 or 15 years of honest, determined effort he could become a successful landowner, contributing to the wealth and prosperity of his country—his country more than it is that of any other American, because of the fact that he has had the privilege of offering his life to it.

Unquestionably the most representative gathering of ex-service men that has ever been held was the national caucus of the American Legion, held in St. Louis last month. Fifteen hundred men, in round numbers, representing every branch of service, and every rank from general to buck private, men selected by popular vote in their respective States and communities, composed this body. There were men who bore medals for distinguished bravery and service, gold chevroned and silver chevroned men, men whose service had brought them to the full vigor of mental and physical manhood, men of whom war had demanded a lung or a limb. This convention, gentlemen, went on record unanimously as being in favor of soldier-settlement legislation such as you are considering. Hence, I believe there can be no serious question in the minds of any of you, be you from Michigan, or Indiana, or Kansas, or the far West, but that the service men desire this legislation. They do, and although the vast majority of them could not tell you concretely the exact form they desire it to take, they expect you to decide that problem for them.

I have given considerable thought and attention to the relative merits of the community settlement plan, and to the one which Congressman Ferris has called the misnamed "infiltration" plan, the plan of individual selection in settled communities. I believe there is much to be said in favor of both, and in my opinion the best measure would be one that would permit of the application of both methods. As I understand the interpretation of the Interior Department, the Mondell bill would permit the use of both. A group of five or six farms, for example, or of perhaps a hundred within the confines of one county, where they could easily be supervised by a county agent, would constitute a community; because there is not a reason why it should take a 50,000-acre tract to constitute a community, is there?

But I do want to urge the necessity of supervision, both for the welfare of the soldier and to safeguard the interests of the Government. Through county agents it seems to me that it would be altogether practical to properly supervise 50 or 100 farms in a county, even though they were not all contiguous. Then, the question of the advisability of using the community plan, it seems to me, would necessarily be governed largely by the conditions of rural life in the various sections of the country. There is much truth in the popular song of the day which asks, "How are you going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paree?" The average soldier is not going to take to rural life unless it offers civilized attractions. If, under the individual-selection plan, or "infiltration," he can settle in a community which suits him, where he has ties of family or friendship, where the farmers are progressive and modern in their practices, he should be able to settle there successfully and contentedly. On the other hand, if he is to go into a territory where rural community life is not at its best, where there are not the diversions which his tastes and experiences will demand, it seems as if the community development plan would be best, because the plan can provide for the establishment of the things he requires. And so I am inclined to urge that the administrators of the soldier-settlement act be given broad discretionary powers in the matter of selecting localities and methods. Never doubt for one moment that if the administrators do not comply within reason to the popular demands of the beneficiaries of this legislation the said beneficiaries will make it known in no uncertain terms. And the administrators, being desirous of making the work a success, are certain to heed the popular voice of the soldiers.

When I first read some of the testimony of opponents of this bill and this legislation, I was angry clean through, and as an ex-service man was glad I was not present when they were on the stand. I might have acted unwisely. However, I am sure that the gentlemen of this committee are altogether too broad and big to allow their decisions to be biased by persons with purely selfish and narrow-gauged motives. I am sure that the great majority of the Members of Congress desire to do the right thing for the soldier, and only want to be convinced, and sure of what that right thing is. But, in passing, I can not refrain from advancing the thought that some of the opponents, notably Dr. Atkeson, whom I hope misrepresented more farmers than he represented, seem to desire to do something for the soldier, providing it does not affect them and does something for them at the same time. Great heavens, gentlemen, who if not the ex-soldier has a better right to become the competitor of the established farmer or anyone else? Four millions of men who responded to the call of national duty will do pretty much as they please in the next 50 years, as long as what they desire to do is legitimate. And they will unmake the political careers of men who choose the path of selfishness, either toward the soldier or anyone or anything else. Because if there is any one great lesson that our service has taught us, it has taught us the nobility and strength of cooperative, unselfish effort—just the sort of effort that has saved America from Prussianism. Listen to the overwhelming sentiment of our American Legion caucus in St. Louis—that it was not our desire to "take something from the Government, but rather to put something into the Government." It would be the part of political sagacity for men in public life to keep that pronouncement in mind.

In conclusion may I speak briefly of the matter of a cash bonus? The St. Louis caucus unanimously defeated a resolution that asked for a bonus of six months' pay. It was the sense of the caucus that we wanted an opportunity, not a gift. Soldier settlement appeals to thousands of us as an opportunity, and I feel quite sure that the ex-soldier in Detroit, or Chicago, or New York who does not desire to take advantage of this particular opportunity will support it just as ardently if he feels, as he is sure to do, that it will mean opportunity to a large number of his "buddies." For the soldier is strong for his "buddy"

and wants him to succeed and be happy and prosperous. If the Congress desires to give the men a bonus, I have no doubt that it would be acceptable to the majority, but I do not believe that same majority would, thinkingly, want it to defeat the purposes of soldier settlement legislation, which has a far deeper and more fundamental purpose than a bonus ever could have. The bonus would be a gift; soldier settlement would be a loan, a governmental guaranty of a future that would admirably increase our agricultural wealth and make thousands of prosperous, home-owning citizens who have America and her welfare deeply at heart.

Very respectfully,

J. LEO MEEHAN.

MR. SPRY. I want to say, gentlemen, in opening, that I am very strongly in favor of the bill which you are considering. I was appointed by a committee appointed by the governor of the State of Utah to represent that committee in connection with the other gentlemen that have already appeared and presented their views with relation to this bill and why they favor its passage.

Sometime ago, in collaboration with Secretary Lane and in line with the bill which he presented, I think at the last Congress, the governor of Utah called together a conference of the various Western States. There were, I think, 13 States represented at that time—not merely the arid States of the West, but States representing the cut-over lands—and there was an effort made to have the States represented which had the wet lands, or the lands which were subject to drainage, in attendance; and as a result of that conference a resolution was adopted, which doubtless you have before you—I have a copy of it in Mr. Lane's report, and I presume that is before the committee—in which that conference went on record as favoring the then so-called Lane bill because of what they regarded as the benefits that would accrue from that bill to the different States that were most vitally interested.

I want to say at the commencement that there is no particular locality that I have any desire to represent as against any other locality. This is a great country, and there is no question in my mind but what in every locality of the United States there are certain lands that can be benefited by the provisions of this bill. For instance, the waste lands, or the lands that have been turned out or forsaken in the New England States—and you will find, I presume, many scores, if not many hundreds, of just such farms that perhaps originally have been productive, but which to-day are not in use at all. They have been abandoned. You will find thousands upon thousands of acres in the Northwest and in the North of cut-over timberlands that I think the provisions of this bill could be applied to.

There are many hundreds of thousands of acres in the Southern States—wet lands, lands subject to drainage—that could be materially benefited by the provisions of this bill.

There are also the arid lands, the public lands of the West, that could be materially benefited. So that I don't think and have never regarded this bill as a sectional bill, because it is not; and if a proper appropriation is made of the appropriation which the bill asks for, I can imagine that every State would receive some benefit in a greater or less degree. If there are any States that could not be benefited by the provisions of this bill, the fault is not with the bill; it is with the State, and there is no reason why the problems that the various States have had to deal with now for so many years past should be burdened

upon this bill, because the problem of Iowa, for instance, has been a problem to the State of Iowa for more than 20 years. According to the last census there were less people in Iowa in 1910 than there were in 1900, and the people have voluntarily left Iowa not because of the fact, perhaps, that they could not make a living, but because their ways were largely hedged up, and they wanted to get into a country of broader expanse, and it appears that many of them have gone in to my friend Mr. Smith's country, and have availed themselves of the splendid opportunities that the State of Idaho offers.

There is another reason. Most of these States, particularly the Middle Western States, and many other States, have utilized the privileges that have come to them from the Federal Government many years ago, and which have of recent dates, or covering a period of 20 or 30 years past, come to the western States in the way of the public-land question, and they have disposed of their public lands and have received the benefits of the sale of those public lands. There is scarcely any acreage whatsoever but what is upon the assessment roll of those various States which have disposed of their public lands, and the States are getting in every respect the benefits of the revenues derived from taxation. That is not true largely of other States.

In my own State, for instance, there is still approximately 73 per cent of the entire area of the State of Utah that is still public domain. So that 27 per cent, perhaps, of the area of Utah is carrying the burden of the 73 per cent. We are policing at 73 per cent. The children located upon that large expanse of territory are being educated at the expense of the 27 per cent. What roads are built through that territory—and of necessity roads must be built through there—roads as good as those which are being built in the 27 per cent—are being paid for by the 27 per cent. So that there are problems existing in the West, and what I say of Utah, perhaps, is true of every other State; true of Idaho, true of Colorado, and of every one of the public-land States of the West.

So that there are problems to meet there that are not being met in the Middle States, and to my mind it is not germane to the bill to undertake to saddle the problem of the States of the Middle West upon this bill, because it finds no place there. Now, I am for the soldier. I take it, however, that every soldier that was in the war can receive not an equal benefit from this bill, because in the first place there is not money enough to go around. I also believe very emphatically that there is a very large percentage of the soldiers who will not want to avail themselves of the provisions of the bill, because financially he is so fixed that there is no occasion for him to ask for any beneficent legislation at the hands of the Federal Government in his behalf. And yet I think I am safe in saying that in so far as the soldier himself is concerned—and I have obtained this from men who have attended their national as also their State conventions, called for the purpose of organization—I am very well satisfied that they are unanimous, whether in their national conventions or in their State or district conventions—that they are unanimously in favor of this bill because of the good that it might do some one or other of their soldier brethren.

MR. BENHAM. Will you please repeat that statement, Governor? I did not get it.

Mr. SPRY. I say, I believe that almost unanimously—

Mr. BENHAM (interposing). I did not understand what organization you referred to.

Mr. SPRY. I am referring now to the American Legion, the organization that has been effected of recent date.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the American Legion?

Mr. SPRY. It is an organization of returned soldiers and sailors or enlisted men who were engaged in the war.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the organization formed at St. Louis the other day?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir; I think there was a national organization effected there, and I know in my own State and probably in yours and other Western States there have been State organizations effected, and they are proceeding, I think, as in this instance, to go on record in favor of the bill because of the help that it will extend to the soldier, sailor, or marine.

There has been a good deal said with relation to the colonizing plan of the people of Utah. I am not particularly familiar with the plan as suggested of recent date by Mr. Hansen, who was before you the day before yesterday. I take it, however, that that is planned upon a very small scale. As I understand he hasn't much more than perhaps \$100,000 to prosecute the work of the plan, but the general plan of colonization on the part of the people of Utah I am familiar with, having lived there for the last 44 years, and that plan has been very much of a success. The people in the earlier days of settlement of the West naturally flocked to the stream of water, because water was the life of the country. It was before the days of dry farming or arid-land farming, and it was necessary in order for the people to raise their bread to get upon the streams that flowed from the mountains, and as a result, two or three or more families would go wherever they could find a stream of water, and it so happened that in the distribution of that water it was distributed upon small tracts of land, because of necessity they could only cultivate small tracts.

The water has increased and where in some instances a half dozen families located upon some of the streams of the State, to-day you will find a population of from one to two and three thousand people. So that through careful adjudication of the rights of the stream and the various distribution that has been made of the water, it has been made possible to reclaim a very great deal of the land that would otherwise still remain in its virgin state. But the Interior Department has something of that idea in mind when they speak of the colonization plan. At the same time there are very many opportunities offered in the West, and, representing the West, I naturally speak of the West not, however, with any desire to be detrimental in what I say to any other part of the country. I take it that every other part is capable of representing its own interests, but there are a very great many situations out there that can very properly be reached, and very successfully reached, even under the provisions of this bill. There are large tracts of land within the populous centers of many of the Western States that to-day are not drawing water for irrigation purposes, and if the Government desires to go into those States for the purpose of establishing an irrigation sys-

tem, there is no question in my mind but what they can find sufficient land in one body to establish a project here for, say, 10 families, there for a hundred families, and so on, until those that desire to be accommodated can undoubtedly receive that accommodation.

There are many opportunities in the West, as there are in many other parts of the country. There are many opportunities in the South that can be availed of, or that are available, to my certain knowledge in my travels through the South.

There are many of the cut-over lands that can be utilized, and coming on east in company with a gentleman from Alabama, who is a Baptist preacher, I was informed that there are many of the lands which 10 or 15 years ago were selling for probably \$1 an acre that had been so well cared for in the meantime that to-day they were bringing from \$75 to \$100 and \$150 an acre. So that I say in the provisions of this bill there is no reason why all parts of the country should not be taken care of, and I hope that the committee, and I hope that Congress, will not consider it in any sense a sectional bill, but a bill to provide homes for the men who want homes, and there are plenty of men who are desirous of leaving the various States in the Union to go into other States. I know my own State is made up of a class of people from perhaps all of the States in the Union, and incidentally I want to say that my own State has furnished largely the population—that is, the pioneer population—of very nearly every one of the Western States. It is true of Colorado; it is true of California; it is true of Idaho; it is true of Arizona and of Montana, Washington in part, and Oregon, and all of those States in the West. The young men of Utah have gone to those States for the purpose of establishing colonies, and I take it have made representative citizens of the States which they have selected in their work of development.

Mr. RAKER. And don't forget Nevada.

Mr. SPRY. No; in Nevada they have done very much, and they have done very much in Canada, and unfortunately they tried to do very much in Mexico and they did not meet with any very favorable results there. A great many of them have come back home. Some of them are tied up so tight there that they can't get back home, but a great many people have come back from Mexico, and in many instances, Mr. Chairman, that is a class of people that the church is trying to assist to obtain homes, because they come back stripped of everything they have. Some of them haven't sufficient clothing to wear.

Now, it is true that where this bill can not reach those who desire help, you have your system of Federal farm loans. A great many people of the West are availing themselves of that opportunity to obtain homes, and then the Western States, like my own State, through the State land boards, are providing a way by which many of the young men can obtain homes. They are selling the land at a minimum price of \$2.50 an acre, and from that to \$40 an acre. I know while I was governor of the State we put through the so-called Piute project, and we were enabled to sell to the people who desired to go upon that project—and we sold to them regardless of where they came from, whether it was from Iowa or from Massachusetts or from Utah or any other State—

Mr. TAYLOR (interposing). Or from Indiana?

Mr. SPRY. I think we have some from Indiana. We sold the land and the water at actual cost, and it was very possible for those people who came upon that particular project to obtain very productive soil at a figure not to exceed \$38 to \$46 an acre, and they have 10 years to pay for it. That is the limit of time extended by the State Land Board of Utah. They were sold the land by making a payment of one-tenth of the purchase price down, and the remaining nine-tenths was divided into a period of 10-year payments at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. In addition to that, the State has also provided a loan agency and the legislature has given preference to farm loans at a rate not to exceed 6 per cent, and there are many other people who, after they have secured homes through the State by buying State lands, have availed themselves of the opportunity to borrow money that way in order that they might make the necessary improvements.

And I want to say in connection with this matter, that while the title has remained in the State in all lands that have been sold by the State, the purchaser was taxed each year according to the equity that he might have in the land. In other words, if he has made five payments, he is taxed just one-half the value that the assessor might put upon that particular tract of land which he has purchased. It has been found necessary that that should be done in order that the State might be looked after and in order that the general funds might be protected, in order that we might make our appropriations for our schools and our roads and our general work of improvement that is going on there.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You can not apply that principle to lands taken up on the public domain, can you?

Mr. SPRY. Yes; we could loan money to a man.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I mean the taxing proposition.

Mr. SPRY. No; that is Federal land, of course, but we do tax a man's improvements on the Federal land, although we can not, of course touch the realty.

In this way many thousands of acres of land in Utah have been put under cultivation that otherwise would not have been under cultivation.

Mr. RAKER. Governor, you just tax the improvements as personal property?

Mr. SPRY. As personal property; yes, sir. They take the improvements—cattle and whatever else he may have succeeded in getting—and we loan money on that, so that the man can make still more improvements and probably put under cultivation more of the acreage that he has succeeded in obtaining from the Government.

Now, I could tell you a long story, gentlemen, but I know the time is getting short. If there are any questions that the gentlemen would like to ask, I would be very glad if it is possible to answer them—any reasonable questions which might be put with relation to the bill itself. I want to have it understood emphatically that I am strong for the bill, because I believe that it will accomplish a vast amount of good not merely for the soldier, but it will develop the country, but it will develop a still more loyal attachment on the part of the soldier for the country, for someone has said—I don't know who it was, and I don't know that I particularly care, but it is

true—someone has said that the owners of the soil become the rulers of the Nation. And because of the fact that men are planted upon the soil and that they can raise their families and they understand the relationship of the soil to those families, that men love their country, and if every American owned his own home, whether it be a city lot or a 40-acre farm or a 640-acre farm, in my humble judgment, he would be a very much better citizen and more loyal to his country. I am a firm believer in the owner of the soil. You can rely upon him, and for that reason it will be money well invested. It is money that will come back to the country. I am not a believer in the idea that the soldier is going upon the land to reap what he can the first two or three years and abandon the farm and throw it upon the country. He has an equity in it before he can get on it. He is supposed to put up a certain percentage of every dollar that is loaned.

I am like Mr. Hansen and others that have come before the committee: I would increase the percentage from 5 to 10 per cent for the initial payment, because it ties the man closer to the farm. It gives you a better hold upon him, as he has a better hold upon the farm, and the man that has any considerable equity in a proposition that he has invested in is not likely to leave it and abandon it, but he is going in to make a success of it, as those people have made a success of the lands that Mr. Green has just spoken of.

I don't think that the Government should assume the rôle of the pure philanthropist. This is purely a business proposition, and undoubtedly in the hands of the careful men who will control and adopt rules and regulations governing it. There is no question in my mind but what the rights of the Government will be amply protected and cared for.

I will say this, that I have no doubt that every effort will be made on the part of the people of Utah, through its legislature—they have already provided for the issue of a million dollars' worth of bonds to be associated with this, whatever apportionment may come to Utah from this bill; and I have no doubt but what the legislature, when it convenes again, after we find what the Government is willing to do for my State—I have no doubt, I say, but what they will be willing to make a still further appropriation in order that they might at least equal the 25 per cent, and in that way the provisions of the bill, I think, provide that the State shall take over the management and control of the project, subject, of course, to the regulations of the Interior Department. So that I am not afraid of anything getting in there but what will be perfectly right and proper. I don't mean to say that every man that goes on to every piece of land will make a success of it. Every lawyer doesn't make a success of his profession; every governor doesn't make a success of his job; and there are failures all down the line. But the rule is that you can depend upon these boys, and they will make good if they find any disposition upon the part of the Federal Government to extend the helping hand and make it possible for them to grow up with the country and become a part and parcel of the Commonwealth where they reside.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask you a question that would seem to be difficult, but I gather that you are as able to answer it, more so

than anybody that has been here—at least, from your own State. You stated that about 73 per cent of your land is yet public domain?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Now, Governor—

Mr. SPRY (interposing). What I mean by that, Mr. White, is that it is nonassessable. It belongs either to the Government or to the State through the State lands. There is very little State land-grant land left.

Mr. WHITE. It is not utilized at this time?

Mr. SPRY. No, sir.

Mr. VAILE. It hasn't been brought under private ownership.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; I understand that. Would you like to say about what percentage of that could be made available for agriculture through the different agencies that might be employed?

Mr. SPRY. On account of the mountainous districts that we have there not all of it could be utilized, but I should say fully one-half of it if the water was available.

Mr. WHITE. Well, do you think the water is available?

Mr. SPRY. Not as yet. It is going to take a very extensive system of reservoirs not only in Utah but all through the western country, and this thing we call conservation has got to be carried out to the very limit in order that those western arid lands may be brought under irrigation.

Mr. WHITE. Is this land now that you speak of, a very large percentage of it, now available for pasturage?

Mr. SPRY. Well, it is all available for pasturage.

Mr. WHITE. Is it valuable for pasturage?

Mr. SPRY. It is not as valuable, perhaps, as the lands would be in a wet region or in a rainy region, but it makes good pasture, particularly the mountain lands, where we get more moisture than we do upon the plains.

Mr. WHITE. I just want to ask one question on generalization. I was very much interested in the statement you made that if these boys had good stuff in them they would make good; that is, the fair proportion. Now, you applied the common-sense analysis to this thing and it pleases me. I will ask you this question: In your opinion, would a larger proportion of boys who have been raised on farms avail themselves of the opportunities presented by this bill than those in cities?

Mr. SPRY. I rather think they would, Mr. White.

Mr. WHITE. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions of the governor?

Mr. NICHOLS. I would like to ask you a couple of questions, if I may.

I agree with what you stated regarding the desirability, from the standpoint of the States, that men should own their soil, own their homes. Now, I will ask you if it would not be just as desirable for a man to own his home in a city or town, as on a farm?

Mr. SPRY. Yes; I am speaking now of the owners of the soil, and, I think, I stated that no matter whether it is a city lot or a 40-acre farm, in the sense of proprietorship or ownership, I am in favor of his owning his home. I am opposed to tenantry of any kind.

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree with you on that. Do you think, Governor, that it would be better to devise some plan, or that something should

be devised, perhaps, in addition to this measure to take care of those hundreds of thousands of soldiers who have been city-bred, have had no farming experience whatever, to aid them to own a home, to buy a home in the city?

Mr. SPRY. Well, of course, it would be difficult, very difficult, to handle this entire situation in one act—very difficult. In the first place, it would take a tremendous amount of money. But I do think that as the provisions of this bill are demonstrated and men are converted to the idea that it can be made a success, that other provisions can be made in the future to take care of those who desire to still avail themselves of the beneficent legislation of the Federal Government, and in the meantime those who desire a small home in the city can doubtless go to the Federal banks and secure a loan at a low rate of interest, so that they may obtain what they want along that line.

Mr. NICHOLS. And eventually you believe that the Government should enact some legislation that would offer aid to the soldier in the city?

Mr. SPRY. I think the Government should enact some legislation as shall give to all of them the things they most desire.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Governor, you have heard the testimony here and are probably familiar with it, about this measure—the appropriation authorized of \$500,000,000 necessarily would not take care of any more than perhaps 100,000 soldiers.

Mr. SPRY. Oh; probably 200,000. It depends altogether as to what is decided as the limit of aid to be extended.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, if a greater percentage than that desired to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by this measure, then it would be necessary to ask for an additional appropriation?

Mr. SPRY. I think so.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you think that in addition to the appropriation authorized here that that is what would happen?

Mr. SPRY. I believe myself that the provisions of this bill will become so favorable in its application to the soldier boy that there will be a demand for still further legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that it will be so successful?

Mr. SPRY. So successful, I should say.

Mr. NICHOLS. That there will be a demand for still further appropriations?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. And don't you think, Governor, that that would be affected very largely by State appropriations in aid of this general plan?

Mr. SPRY. I have no doubt but what the States would be willing to lend in so far as they are able the helping hand, and to cooperate with the Federal Government. I have always contended for that idea. Take, for instance, the ownership on the part of the State of the water, and the ownership on the part of the Federal Government of the public lands; there ought to be that cooperation always, so that the State and the Federal Government dovetail together and put forth their efforts altogether in favor of the men that want to go upon the land.

Mr. RAKER. After an experience of 40 years, Governor, in Utah, and observing young men going onto farms and ranching, as it is conducted in your State, will you state to the committee whether or

not you have observed that me who have been in the blacksmith business, who have been storekeepers, clerks, telegraph operators, and in all other trades and professions, have gone onto farms and have made good, irrespective of where they were raised or what has been their occupation before they went onto the farm?

Mr. SPRY. Yes; that has been my observation, and it has been particularly marked because of this fact: In the proselyting system of the Mormon Church, where they send their men out in different countries and many men of many kinds and occupations become converts to their doctrine, they have come out to Utah and we have had the watchmaker from Switzerland, we have had the shoemaker and the carpenter and the cabinetmaker and men representing every one of the known trades, and in very many instances—and I think I am safe in saying in the majority of instances—those who came in the early days, not finding anything to do at their chosen profession, have secured for themselves a small tract of land and they have gone on that land and have learned by experience the system of farming, and have made a success of it.

Mr. FERRIS. It depends on the fellow, mostly, doesn't it?

Mr. SPRY. It depends altogether on the fellow. Men are just alike, whether they are in Oklahoma, Utah, California, or somewhere else.

Mr. FERRIS. And if he has the ginger in him he makes good, and the weak-kneed, soft-nosed fellow fails.

Mr. SPRY. He fails, and he ought to fail.

Mr. RAKER. And sometimes the soft-nosed fellow may look fairly good and might be selected to be a good farmer and has been raised on a farm, whereas, as a matter of fact, the other man might not have a good appearance, but you give him a chance and he will beat the other fellow.

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir; it is largely a question of opportunity.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, Governor, you don't think that because this bill may not accomplish everything that everybody wants for all the soldiers, and because it doesn't cover the whole field of legislation that Congress will probably ultimately cover for the soldiers, that is no reason why this start should not be made in this direction?

Mr. SPRY. You never did enact a bill in Congress that accomplished everything that it was desired to do. It takes a series of legislative acts. It is a matter of compromise after all.

Mr. TAYLOR. And there will probably be a great many bills passed by Congress for the relief of the soldiers.

Mr. SPRY. No doubt about it. This is the foundation stone that is being laid to-day for the relief and for the benefit and for the help of the soldier who desires to be helped; not by way of any charity or anything of that kind, because I take it that there are few soldiers who would go on the lands under those circumstances, but the boys want a temporary aid extended to them. This lays the foundation and future legislation can build upon that foundation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Even though 95 per cent of the soldiers may not desire or have any inclination to avail themselves of this provision, that is no reason why we should not give the other 5 per cent, if they want it, this opportunity.

Mr. SPRY. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know, Governor, that that was one of the objections to the passage of the original homestead act, that you are

only helping the man who wanted a farm and that you are not helping the mechanic in the city, who desired to stay there, and, therefore, to equalize things, you should give the mechanic in the city \$160, or the equivalent in value of 160 acres of land that you are going to give to somebody?

Mr. SPRY. But who is there to-day but what is in favor of the homestead act?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, yet it was not equal to everybody in the country, and it was giving away the assets of the General Government.

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS. And who is there in the country to-day who doesn't realize that when you establish those homesteads you also made jobs; you made occupations and made homes for men all over the United States, in villages, towns, and cities?

Mr. SPRY. For every additional farm that is created in the West or any other place it puts that much more money into circulation, and I think it was James J. Hill who made the statement that for every family located upon any one of his lines of railroads they were worth fully \$3,000 each to him as a railroad man.

Mr. SUMMERS. I want to say just a little more. Who is there to-day who doesn't realize that when we have provided for a limited number of soldiers that we have in an indirect way benefited the whole number of soldiers by allowing them to have positions and by creating employment for them in the way of building houses, making shoes, clothing, supplying groceries and hardware and everything of that kind, because this is interlocked all the way through? You can't benefit 100,000 of them without benefiting all of them.

Mr. SPRY. You create an additional demand for every commodity of life. The farmer requires more implements. That gives employment to the men of Ohio and Illinois and wherever you have got an implement factory established.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the tendency is to relieve congestion in the city and accelerate, if we can, the movement to the farm.

Mr. SPRY. And that is the one great big problem of to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the great big problem of this country.

Mr. FERRIS. Governor, you look on this proposition as a kind of dual proposition, do you not?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. One economic and one for the relief of the soldier?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. As to the economic proposition and the advantages connected with it, you have spoken quite fully, and other witnesses have, but as to the relief that it accords to the soldier, Governor, it has been charged around this table here by preceding witnesses that it did not give any relief to the soldier; that it was a scheme to get him out onto some wild desert or some marsh or boghole in Florida, and that it didn't amount to anything to the soldier. I want to ask you two or three questions, if I may, regarding that.

There isn't a place in the country where a soldier can get a loan of money sufficient to buy a farm at 4 per cent for 40 years, is there?

Mr. SPRY. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Mr. FERRIS. And isn't this the first time that that has ever been offered to anybody?

Mr. SPRY. So far as I know; yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And isn't it the first time that there has been offered to a man a living wage, and to have living wages while he has the opportunity to go out and help improve the farm that he later expects to buy on the terms I have just stated?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, what other advantages do you have in mind that it really affords the soldier who desires to avail himself of one of these homes?

Mr. SPRY. Well, I think those three things will largely cover it. It enables the man to obtain employment while the project is being built. If he has a family, he can support his family by the wage that the Government is paying him for construction work. It enables him to become conversant with the project upon which he is working; it enables him to understand the nature of any particular tract of land that is upon the project; it will give him a preference in his selection.

Mr. FERRIS. And, as a matter of fact, he gets good, living wages?

Mr. SPRY. All the time.

Mr. FERRIS. For creating and building the home that he expects to acquire, and he gets a living wage while he is acquiring the experience necessary to make his home a success.

Mr. SPRY. Exactly.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, supposing a penniless soldier gets out of the Army to-day, absolutely without a penny—as most of them will get out—this does afford that man a chance, if he has the right stuff in him, to get immediate employment, doesn't it, if this bill is enacted?

Mr. SPRY. Mr. Ferris, it is like manna from heaven to that man.

Mr. FERRIS. And if he has the bulldog tenacity that you and I had when we took up our homesteads out there—and any other fellow that is holding onto one—couldn't he stay there and couldn't he work out a home for himself?

Mr. SPRY. Absolutely.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, now, let me pass from that. Even in Utah, which we will say is a sparsely settled State, there will be instances where the community plan would not take care of all the necessities there, would it?

Mr. SPRY. I think so; yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, what harm would there be in attaching to this bill an alternative proposition which would provide, in effect, that in States and in localities where the community proposition or colonization soldier colony plan is not feasible—what harm would there be to insert in this bill an alternative proposition which would enable the Secretary of the Interior to work out the segregated isolated-tract plan?

Mr. SPRY. I see no reason whatever why that could not be done, for this reason: There is a project to-day which has for its purpose the irrigation of certain lands lying in the vicinity of Ogden and Salt Lake City, where perhaps two-thirds of the population of the State resides, so that within a radius of 50 miles from Salt Lake City you can put under cultivation more land than is already being culti-

vated. Mr. Hays is acquainted with the project. In the county where Ogden is located I presume 20,000 acres could be obtained. In the county between the two cities, the county of Davis, in a county containing the choicest land that can be found anywhere in the world—and I don't bar any—the report came to me from a banker the other day just before I left where a man, through intensively cultivating 2 acres of land in garden truck and small fruits, from those 2 acres of land gathered from \$3,500 to \$4,000 a year. The banker said: "I know he is doing it, because I handle his money." Now, I don't mean to say that every acre is going to produce in quantity like that, but it is an evidence of what can be done. Now, within 5 miles of that man's land—yes, less than 5 miles—there is land waiting to-day simply for the water that can be put under cultivation, and these boys can go there, and I take it that they would rather go to the centers of civilization of the various States. It is right that they should go there. I want to say incidentally you are not going to put your soldier boy out on a desert. He won't go. I don't think he should be asked to go. Give him a location where he can enjoy some of the benefits of modern civilization, and there isn't a State in the Union but what can furnish him just such propositions if he desires to avail himself of them.

Mr. FERRIS. And why could we not, Governor, with equal propriety, save all the good features of this Lane bill and the Mondell bill that we have here and use that wherever it is applicable, and why couldn't we meet the worries and the anxieties of some of these witnesses here, and also some members of the committee and some Members of the House who are opposing this bill, by adding to it an alternative proposition so that we could take care of some of the other fellows that don't want to go onto these farms?

Mr. SPRY. I think you have a perfect right, and I think it is the proper thing to do to adjust the bill to the needs of the men.

Mr. FERRIS. For example, here come the men from Ohio and Illinois and Indiana and Iowa, and they have fears that their land is so high-priced, the initial cost so high, plus these overhead charges, that may be necessary to break the soldier in and get him established on the land, that they think it will make the land so high that it will not be attractive to the soldier. In other words, he will say, "Well, I can buy a farm—I can buy my father's farm for less than the Government is offering me this." So the result is he don't have any relief at all. Now, isn't it the duty of the committee to give some attention to that?

Mr. SPRY. Some attention ought to be paid to that; yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Otherwise we will be met in the House and elsewhere with the statement that we are passing something for the benefit of a few Western States, something for the benefit of a few boggy, marsh States in the South, and that the great bulk of the population of the United States will not get any relief from it. That is the fear of a lot of good Members of Congress and some members of this committee and a lot of witnesses here, and I was quite anxious to get your opinion on that, because I know you have been through the flint mill out in the western country, and your opinion is valuable.

Mr. SPRY. Anything that can be done to adjust the situation and meet the opposition to the bill I think ought to be done. At the same

time I don't think that you can ask the soldier boy to go onto any land costing \$100, \$200, \$300, or \$450 an acre. It can not be done.

Mr. FERRIS. He can not pay it out.

Mr. SPRY. No man can undertake to make a living on a proposition of that kind. So that where that can not be done in some of these States, I suppose we will have to offer them opportunities in the South and in the West and in the Northwest.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true, Governor, but we have got to make the hill not so steep that it will scare the soldier away.

Mr. SPRY. No; don't make the hill too steep.

Mr. FERRIS. It has got to be made so that the soldier can climb it.

Mr. SPRY. This bill is altogether in the interest of the soldier, and his preferences must of necessity be taken into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is 12 o'clock, and the water-power bill comes up this morning, a very important measure.

Mr. MAYS. I want to ask the Governor just one question. You stated awhile ago that you couldn't get the soldier to go onto a desert. Without explanation, that in the record might give a bad impression. It might not convey the thought that you had in mind. What do you mean by that?

Mr. SPRY. My idea was this—and I am very glad that you called my attention to that—what I meant by the desert was upon these far-away projects, away from railroads, away from close communication with the centers of population; and yet, if any one of the young men care to do that, and as you say, go out and grow up with the country, undoubtedly railroads will go wherever the business justifies them going, as they did in southern Idaho. The railroads went to where the people were producing these immense crops that Mr. Green talks about.

Mr. MAYS. They were deserts at the time.

Mr. SPRY. But when you put water on them, you don't have to wait long for production.

Mr. MAYS. Your idea was, if I understood you, that you could not get a man to go way out by himself and isolate himself upon a desert where there was no plan to improve it?

Mr. SPRY. No, sir.

Mr. MAYS. And bring it into cultivation?

Mr. SPRY. You are right on that.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I ask the governor a question? Did you say something about the State of Utah aiding people to settle on the public lands, the State lands of Utah?

Mr. SPRY. Yes; the State land board, through the funds that it has on hand for the various State institutions, obtained through the land grants that came to the State. That money is loaned to men for improvements, and the legislature has provided that the farmer shall have the preference in all of those loans.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; but do they loan money to make the initial investment?

Mr. SPRY. Sometimes, yes; if they want more land, yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. At what rate of interest?

Mr. SPRY. Six per cent.

Mr. NICHOLS. For how many years?

Mr. SPRY. Well, covering a period of years, according to any agreement that might be made, but not to exceed 10. They loan about 40 per cent, not to exceed 50 per cent, of the valuation of the thing that they are loaning on.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Ferris said something—called your attention to the fact that this bill provided employment for the soldiers.

Mr. SPRY. That is on the construction of the various projects.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. SPRY. It will provide that employment, the building of roads, reservoirs, etc.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; but did you hear the statement made by Mr. Davis, of the Reclamation Service, regarding that part of the bill?

Mr. SPRY. No, sir; I have not discussed it with Mr. Davis at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. He stated before this committee that the condition of unemployment that it was expected would exist on the return of the soldiers does not exist in the way they thought it would exist and that the feature of the bill does not obtain as it was expected it would.

Mr. SPRY. Well, that may be. I don't know about that. That is a matter, of course, for the exigency of the occasion.

Mr. Chairman, early in the hearings Mr. T. C. Atkeson, legislative representative of the National Grange, appeared before the committee in opposition of the pending bill. He stated that the National Grange, with a membership of nearly 1,000,000 extending from Maine to Oregon, and was especially strong in the West, was opposed to the pending legislation on the ground that there was an abundance of untenanted farms near market centers to supply all the soldiers who may wish farm land. I wish to insert in the record at this point an editorial from the Evening Capital News, of Boise, Idaho, under date of June 23, containing a telegram addressed to Mr. Atkeson by W. W. Deal, master of the Idaho State Grange, to the effect that Mr. Atkeson did not represent the sentiment of Idaho and requesting him to so state to the committee. Up to the present time he has not done so, so far as I am advised. The editorial is as follows:

WHERE IDAHO STANDS.

W. W. Deal, master of the State Grange, leaves no room for doubt as to where Idaho stands on the Mondell bill. Every farmer in this State will indorse the sentiment expressed by him in his telegram to T. C. Atkeson, National Grange legislative representative at Washington, in which he said:

"Reports current that you oppose soldiers' land bill. If so, you do not represent the sentiment of Idaho. Please represent us before congressional committee in behalf of Mondell bill."

The Capital News pointed out in a recent issue that Mr. Atkeson spoke without authority from Idaho farmers when he informed the public lands committee farmers generally were against the soldier land act, for they, above all others, realize what irrigation means to this State. It extends to Mr. Deal its hearty indorsement of his instructions to Mr. Atkeson.

I also desire to insert in the record the following resolutions by the John Regan Post of World War Veterans, Boise, Idaho:

RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States, commonly known as the soldiers' settlement act, or the Lane land bill, providing for the reclamation of a vast acreage of arid, cut-over, and swamp

lands in the United States, and for the furnishing of homes and employment for soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Great War; and

Whereas we believe that the greatest question confronting the United States during the reconstruction period after the war is the adequate development of its vast resources and the furnishing of employment for the many citizens whose participation in the war or in war industries threw them out of their former occupations and employment; and

Whereas the said soldiers' settlement act failed to pass at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the John Regan Post of the World War Veterans as follows: That we deeply appreciate the efforts of the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and of our delegation in Congress to secure the passage of such bill; that we are heartily in favor of the enactment of such legislation as will assist returning soldiers, sailors, and marines in the securing of rural homes and suitable employment and in reclaiming the 5,000,000 acres of arid, swamp, and cut-over lands in the State of Idaho, which can be reclaimed at a reasonable cost; and that we strongly urge our Senators and Representatives at the next session of Congress of the United States to devote their utmost endeavors to securing the introduction and passage of the said soldiers' settlement bill or similar legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Hon. William E. Borah, the Hon. John F. Nugent, the Hon. Addison T. Smith, and the Hon. Burton L. French.

I also submit the following resolutions from the Boise Trades and Labor Council, Boise, Idaho:

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT MEMORIAL.

Whereas there exists, within the State of Idaho, about 12,000,000 acres of unappropriated and unreserved public lands, thousands and thousands of acres of which need but to be reclaimed by clearing or by the application of water in order to make them productive of abundant crops of foodstuffs and fit for happy homes; and

Whereas there is and always will be urgent need for development of all reclaimable land in the United States, inasmuch as America is now and for many years to come, will be called upon to supply much of the food for devastated European countries; and

Whereas it is now the one great duty and the one unbounded privilege of America to reward the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have done service in our Army and Navy, and who by that service have shown that they are willing to lay their all upon the altar of humanity's need; and

Whereas adequate reward comes not through presentation of medals and inscriptions of names upon tablets of stone, but through opportunities for these vigorous young men to procure land and construct homes so the larger number of them who so desire may heed the call of nature and follow the constructive and productive pursuits of outdoor life; and

Whereas the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho tentatively appropriated \$100,000 for cooperation with the Federal Government in soldier settlement work, which appropriation will be unavailable unless a Federal appropriation for like purposes is made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Boise Trades and Labor Council, in regular session assembled this 4th day of June, 1919, that we hereby urge upon the present session of the United States Congress immediate passage of such efficient legislation as will set in motion Federal Government machinery for reclamation of unappropriated and unreserved public lands in the United States; that provisions be included for liberal appropriations to the various States that have made tentative laws pending the cooperation of the Federal Government for soldier settlement work, and that provisions also be included in congressional legislation that will afford to United States soldiers, sailors, and marines as nearly free access to public lands for the purposes of reclamation and home building thereon as is possible to give, or, at least, that payments for same be so arranged as to make the procurement of sufficient land to assure livelihood compatible with American standards of living an immediate and desirable possibility for each veteran of the Great War, and, further,

Be it known that we condemn in no uncertain terms the man or set of men who would, for partisan reasons, delay soldier settlement legislation one

moment longer than is necessary in order to attain the highest ideals in the prosecution of this paramount public duty.

BOISE TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,
By LAWRENCE O. NICHOLS, *President*.

Attest:

[SEAL.]

J. K. RADLEY, *Secretary*.

Adopted by unanimous vote June 4, 1919.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, haven't we reached the end of that six hours?

The CHAIRMAN. We have reached the end of our hearings.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that they close.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose that we had better meet again on our regular meeting day next Tuesday.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I was anxious to have Mr. Davis, of the Reclamation Service, answer a few questions for information. If there is another gentleman here representing the Reclamation Service, I would be glad to ask him.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Davis is not here. We can get him up any time for our purpose.

Mr. NICHOLS. All right, if that is suitable.

STATEMENT OF MR. H. T. CORY, CONSULTING ENGINEER, UNITED STATES RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Mr. CORY. If you will ask the questions, I will tell you frankly whether or not I can answer them.

Mr. NICHOLS. What I wanted to find out, Mr. Cory, was if you can tell me what the average wage will be, the average wage—it has been understood here that the man would have an average wage on these projects of probably \$4 a day.

Mr. CORY. Absolutely nothing has been decided about that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Can you say how much he would likely be paid?

Mr. CORY. He would be paid the going wages.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, now, I notice that—

Mr. CORY (interposing). It will undoubtedly have to be an eight-hour day. That is national legislation. The wages to be paid will vary according to what the man does, whether he is a machinist, a garage man, or something else. You doubtless mean general common labor.

Mr. NICHOLS. I wanted to know about common labor, the common wage. I understood Mr. Davis to say that they would probably earn \$1,200 a year.

Mr. CORY. I think the average wage would be about \$4 a day for common labor, because they are paying 50 cents an hour for section labor on at least a few of the railroads to-day. Fifty cents an hour is the present current wage in a good many agricultural communities for agricultural labor, and I think we would not pay less.

Mr. VAILE. It will be the current wage in the community.

Mr. CORY. Yes; but it has no absolutely fixed figure. It doubtless will not be the same during all the next five years. It is just a plain proposition of the current wage in each locality, just as the railroads pay current wages.

Mr. NICHOLS. That will be the current wage in the particular community, the particular locality where the project is located?

Mr. CORY. Exactly.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, I understood Mr. Davis to say that the average wage paid—the average wage that they expected to pay employees on these projects was \$4 a day.

Mr. CORY. I think you misunderstood him.

Mr. NICHOLS. I may have. I thought that was what he testified. I will look it up.

Mr. CORY. No one can say what the average wage on an entire project would be. It would depend on the relative amounts of various characters of work.

Mr. TAYLOR. What the wage is now would be no indication of what it will be a year from now or two years from now.

Mr. CORY. It may not. At the present time, with the present wage scale throughout the whole country, I should say that about \$4 per day for common labor is about right, but there is nothing in the law that fixes it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think I am responsible for that idea that the wage will be \$4 a day, Mr. Nichols. I was doing some figuring one day when Mr. Mondell was here, and I used \$4 a day as the basis for my figuring, that was all, and since that time I have noticed that the wage of \$4 a day has been discussed pretty generally. I thought it was a reasonable wage, an average wage.

Mr. RAKER. It is impossible for this committee to determine the question of wages on a project.

The CHAIRMAN. No; we are not trying to determine that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am just asking for information.

Mr. CORY. Mr. Nichols wanted to know if we had any predetermined ideas on that, and we have not.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. You contemplate, of course, paying the prevailing wage in the locality where the work is done?

Mr. CORY. The prevailing wage, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. BENHAM. Would you make a distinction in different parts of the country? Would you pay the soldier in one part of the country 45 cents an hour and in another part less or more?

Mr. CORY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BENHAM. Would the soldier be satisfied with that arrangement?

Mr. CORY. Undoubtedly he will. For instance, in certain States a carpenter gets \$7 a day, and in another State he gets \$5. Those carpenters are satisfied because of the differing local costs of living. For example, in California you get beefsteak for 35 cents a pound and in Washington you pay 50 cents.

Mr. BENHAM. Does the Government pay a carpenter in one place \$7 a day and in another place \$5 a day?

Mr. CORY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BENHAM. I presume you know.

Mr. CORY. Oh, yes; the Reclamation Service has had projects for the past 17 years all over the West and the scale of wages has not been identically the same for the same work.

Mr. BENHAM. The Government pays the soldiers here in Washington, where the cost of living is higher than it is in some other sections—does the Government pay the soldiers here the same wages here in Washington that it would out at Fort Sill or somewhere else?

Mr. CORY. I think they do, absolutely.

Mr. VAILE. I think, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow a suggestion, the question is no comparison at all. The soldier has an occupation which is not comparable to anything else in the world. Furthermore, it is an occupation which he is required to render as a matter of public safety.

Mr. BARBOUR. And the Government furnishes him with his living.

Mr. CORY. Of course, in that particular there is also some complaint, you know, because soldiers at \$35 a month are working side by side in some camps with men getting three dollars and a half a day and doing identically the same work.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we will have to go to the House and this will conclude our hearings unless you have another question to ask.

Mr. BENHAM. No; but the governor who spoke just before, made a statement that I thought ought not to go without a challenge, that the Loyal Legion was practically speaking unanimously in favor of the Mondell bill. Now, there has been a representative of that organization here several days, and in his talk with me he specified the fact that they were not—at least that he commended the thought that I have been advancing, of the segregated project.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does he want to appear before the committee?

Mr. BENHAM. I shall either suggest that this gentleman be allowed to appear or that we get his views before accepting unreservedly the governor's statement in regard to the position of that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You have your statement contrary to the governor's statement.

Mr. BENHAM. And let us find out who is right.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you want to present that witness to the committee?

Mr. BENHAM. I should say that he ought to have an opportunity to appear.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is he in town?

Mr. BENHAM. He was in the last day or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The governor did not assume to speak for the legion; he gave his opinion and Mr. Benham has given his opinion contrary to it, and it is a matter for the committee and the House to find out.

Mr. RAKER. What is the order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BENHAM. I understand we have one hour and eight minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. No; this closes our hearings.

Mr. RAKER. And the chairman will notify us when we will take up the bill for consideration by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the next meeting day is next Tuesday.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But the closing of the hearings, Mr. Chairman, doesn't preclude the privilege that members might have in calling for witnesses or officers of the Government for additional information.

The CHAIRMAN. For the committee, yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that will be for the information of the committee.

Mr. RAKER. Then I understand the hearings are closed?

The CHAIRMAN. The hearings are closed.

(Whereupon, at 12.15 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.)

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

ON

H. R. 487

**A BILL TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT AND RURAL HOMES
FOR THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED WITH THE MILITARY
AND NAVAL FORCES THROUGH THE RECLAMATION
OF LANDS TO BE KNOWN AS THE "NATIONAL
SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT."**

HOMES FOR SOLDIERS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have your letter of May 20, 1919, inclosing copy of the bill H. R. 487, upon which you request an early report to your committee.

It is drawn upon lines similar to those bills introduced in the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress by Representative Taylor, of Colorado (H. R. 15993), and Representative Byrnes of South Carolina (H. R. 13651), and upon which this department made favorable reports. It is also, in its main features, in harmony with bills introduced in the present Congress by Representatives Knutson (H. R. 274), Blanton (H. R. 294), Raker (H. R. 415), Taylor of Colorado (H. R. 457), Byrnes of South Carolina (H. R. 479), and Ferris (H. R. 492), which measures have not yet been formally presented to the department for consideration.

One of the principal differences between H. R. 487 and the measures introduced in the last session of Congress is that the former bill authorizes an appropriation of \$500,000,000, while the measures introduced at the last session authorized smaller amounts. Various other minor changes have been made with the view of advancing the interests of the soldiers and for the better protection of the investment of the United States.

The scope of the bill is clearly indicated by its title, which is, "A bill to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands, to be known as the 'National Soldier Settlement Act.'"

The enactment of this legislation will help the soldier—

1. By providing him with employment upon his separation from the military service, affording him an opportunity not only to gain a livelihood but to acquire and save the funds necessary for the payment of the first installment upon his farm.

2. By providing him with the opportunity for securing an improved farm home.

3. Providing the money or credit needed to improve or equip his farm and to secure same at a wholesale price.

4. Reduce the cost of farm buildings and other permanent improvements through the purchase of material in wholesale quantities and for cash.

5. Give him an opportunity to get practical advice regarding farming operations.

6. Permit of the organizing of community settlements for more effective buying of what the settlers need and the selling of what they produce.

7. Make farming more profitable and attractive by the creation of the cooperative organization and the resulting closer social and business relations.

The idea of this bill has had the serious attention of this department for more than a year, and it has been studied from many angles. Careful preliminary investigations of the country have been made as a result of the action of the last Congress making appropriations for an examination of the swamp, cut-over, and arid lands. A report of this work is nearly ready for submission to Congress.

Since February of this year an effort has been made to learn, if possible, the desires of our soldiers in regard to taking up farm life, with the result that nearly 50,000 soldiers have written expressing their interest in the proposition and stating that they would like to have an opportunity to get employment in connection with the work and to take up a farm in a soldier settlement. These responses classified by the State from which the soldier came are listed in the accompanying Exhibit A.

I have also communicated with the governors of each of the States suggesting a form of State legislation for cooperation with the Government in case authority is given by Congress for working out a soldier-settlement plan, and most of the States have expressed strong interest in the matter. I am transmitting herewith Exhibit B, a statement showing the legislation and resolutions adopted by the several States in regard to this matter.

In most of the States which have not by law established organizations for cooperation with the United States, the governors have appointed committees, which are prepared to represent the State in this work.

Public interest in this proposition is indicated in a measure by the letters and action of organizations of all kinds throughout the country. A statement of such of these resolutions as have reached the department is given in Exhibit C.

Foreign countries engaged in the war have recognized the problem and have adopted methods of solving it similar to that proposed by this bill. A compilation of the laws adopted in the English-speaking countries is inclosed, as Exhibit D.

The foregoing will afford an indication of the attitude toward the soldier-settlement plan on the part of the soldiers, the State Governments, foreign governments, and our people generally.

I believe that the bill is one of the most important pieces of constructive legislation before Congress, and recommend its early passage.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,
*Chairman Committee on Public Lands,
House of Representatives.*

Inclosure 1813.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 26, 1919.

DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I am in receipt of your request of May 24 for report on H. R. 492, introduced by Representative Ferris, providing for employment and homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war.

The end sought to be accomplished is similar with that proposed in bills introduced during the last session of Congress by Representatives Taylor, Byrnes, and others, and with H. R. 487 of the present session, upon which the department made a report May 22, 1919. H. R. 492 gives broad general authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry on the work of establishing farm homes and to employ soldiers, sailors, and marines in the work, and is well designed to accomplish the purpose sought. H. R. 487 goes somewhat more into detail and contains special limitations on certain points.

I heartily favor the enactment of legislation proposed in both bills, and trust your committee may see fit to take early action.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

HON. NICHOLAS J. SINNOTT,
House of Representatives.

EXHIBIT A.

Soldier cards received to noon, Wednesday, May 21, 1919:

Alabama	644	New Mexico	214
Arizona	268	New York	2,801
Arkansas	820	North Carolina	441
California	3,592	North Dakota	643
Colorado	729	Ohio	1,700
Connecticut	299	Oklahoma	1,225
Delaware	45	Oregon	1,306
Florida	358	Pennsylvania	1,981
Georgia	633	Rhode Island	154
Idaho	715	South Carolina	294
Illinois	3,293	South Dakota	488
Indiana	1,717	Tennessee	685
Iowa	1,578	Texas	2,002
Kansas	1,263	Utah	408
Kentucky	986	Vermont	75
Louisiana	499	Virginia	639
Maine	145	Washington	1,618
Maryland	243	West Virginia	433
Massachusetts	979	Wisconsin	1,612
Michigan	1,750	Wyoming	177
Minnesota	1,719	District of Columbia	280
Mississippi	587	Alaska	177
Missouri	1,811	Canada	47
Montana	835	Incomplete addresses	909
Nebraska	959	Camps and ships	936
Nevada	80	Foreign	31
New Hampshire	113		
New Jersey	744	Grand total	48,520

EXHIBIT B.

STATE ACTION ON THE SOLDIER-SETTLEMENT PLAN.

The following is a summary of the action taken by the various States on the soldier-settlement plan of the Department of the Interior. Information relating to each State has been checked, so far as possible, by correspondence with the secretary of state, the governor, other State officials, and private individuals:

Alabama.

The legislature has enacted a bill (S. 198), approved February 18, 1919, creating a commission known as the Alabama Post-War Council of Defense, consisting of nine members, as follows: Gov. Kilby, chairman, Montgomery; Fred H. Gornley, vice chairman, Montgomery; Dr. J. F. Dugger, Auburn; Mrs. James F. Hooper, Selma; Dr. Thomas M. Owen, Montgomery; W. S. Keller, Montgomery; Dr. W. S. Welch, Montgomery; Spright Dowell, Montgomery; and M. C. Allgood, Montgomery. This commission is officially in charge of soldier-settlement matters for the State.

It is understood that a soldier-settlement bill was introduced at the January session, but was not passed.

The legislature passed a memorial, No. 70 (H. J. R. 54), approved February 15, 1919, urging the State delegation in Congress to do everything possible to secure the enactment of a Federal soldier-settlement law.

The secretary of state states that "the legislature will reconvene early in July and it is not unlikely that such legislation will be introduced and passed."

Arizona.

The legislature has enacted an act (Substitute H. B. 51), approved March, 1919, providing for cooperation between the State and the United States and appropriating "such sum as may be necessary."

The legislature also passed House Joint Resolution No. 5, approved February 6, 1919, approving the plan and urging the enactment of Federal legislation.

Arkansas.

The legislature passed a joint resolution urging the Arkansas congressional delegation to do everything possible for Federal soldier-settlement legislation; and that Gov. Brough wired President Wilson urging his active support of Federal legislation.

The governor has appointed the following committee to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: Fred Heiskell, chairman, Gazette Building, Little Rock; W. M. Hardy, Southern Trust Building, Little Rock; E. J. Bodman, Union Trust Co., Little Rock; C. T. Coleman, 1101 Boyle Building, Little Rock; Wallace Townsend, 1104 Boyle Building, Little Rock; Gen. Loyd England, Boyle Building, Little Rock; Henry Moore, jr., Texarkana; Allen Kennedy, Fort Smith; C. J. Mansfield, Warren; Leo Andrews, Pine Bluff; R. B. Campbell, Helena; and D. C. Welty, Boyle Building, Little Rock.

California.

The legislature has enacted an act (S. 246) providing for a referendum to the people of a bond issue of \$10,000,000 for soldier settlements; approved April, 1919.

The legislature has also enacted an act (S. 221), approved April, 1919, providing for soldier settlements in cooperation with the United States and carrying an appropriation of \$1,000,000.

It is understood unofficially that the legislature has passed a joint resolution urging the adoption by Congress of soldier-settlement legislation.

Colorado.

The legislature has enacted an act (S. 262), approved April 9, 1919, providing for cooperation in soldier settlements with the Federal Government.

It is understood unofficially that the legislature passed a resolution indorsing the soldier-settlement legislation before the recent Congress.

Connecticut.

Gov. Holcomb urged the adoption of soldier-settlement legislation in his message to the general assembly and introduced a bill early in the session "which covered the ground substantially," but no action was taken.

Delaware.

The legislature has passed a bill (H. B. 182), approved April 2, 1919, providing for the creation of a reconstruction commission, which is in charge of soldier-settlement matters for the State, and making an appropriation of \$25,000. The governor has appointed the following members of the commission: Mrs. Charles R. Miller, 1 Red Oak Road, Wilmington; Mrs. John B. Hutton, Dover; Mrs. Ella Emory, Seaford; W. G. Taylor, Wilmington; Frank R. Poole, McDonough; Arley B. Magee, Dover; George R. Hall, Milford.

Florida.

The legislature enacted a bill (No. 21), approved December 7, 1918, authorizing the internal improvement board to use State lands for soldier settlements and to cooperate with the United States.

The legislature adopted a concurrent resolution (No. 2), approved November 25, 1918, inviting Secretary Lane to address the legislature on the soldier-settlement question.

The governor has appointed the following commission to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: Jules M. Burguières, chairman, West Palm Beach; R. W. Storrs, Consolidated Building, Jacksonville; W. H. Coachman, Consolidated Building, Jacksonville.

Georgia.

A soldier-settlement bill is being drafted to be introduced in the legislature which convenes in June.

The governor has appointed a committee to represent the State in soldier settlement matters as follows: Alex K. Sessoms, chairman, Cogdell; T. E. Phillips, Tifton; W. B. Roddenbery, Cairo; S. C. Townsend, St. Marys; J. J. Brown, Atlanta; F. H. Abbott, Waycross; Neal L. Gillis, Coveny; C. S. Barrett, Union City; J. Phil Campbell, Athens; J. E. Bodenhamer, Decatur; Harvie Jordan, Monticello; W. A. Johnson, Savannah; J. B. Way, Thomasville; George B. Davis, Dublin; W. T. Staten, Valdosta; N. E. French, Valdosta; W. A. Charters, Gainesville; S. B. Yow, Labonia; J. B. Mills, Atlanta; A. J. Fleming, Atlanta; H. M. Stanley, Atlanta; Claude Bond, Toccoa; Josiah Blasingame, Jersey; Lieut. J. A. Dew, Camp Gordon.

Idaho.

The legislature has enacted a bill (H. B. No. 100), approved March 7, 1919, providing for cooperation in soldier settlements with the Federal Government, and appropriating \$100,000, conditioned on the passage of similar legislation by Congress. This bill creates a soldier settlement board consisting of the following: Miles Cannon, commissioner of agriculture, Boise; William J. Hall, commissioner of public works, Boise; Warren G. Swendsen, commissioner of reclamation, Boise.

Illinois.

A bill has been introduced (H. B. No. 121) providing for soldier settlements in cooperation with the United States and carrying an appropriation of \$1,250,000.

A bill has been introduced (S. No. 90) authorizing the department of public works and buildings to cooperate with the department of the interior in the reclamation, improvement, and sale of lands within the State for soldier settlements.

On April 21, 1919, the secretary of state wrote that both bills were pending before the legislature.

Indiana.

A concurrent resolution was introduced in the legislature favoring the passage by Congress of a bill making reclaimed public land available for soldier settlements.

On April 25 the governor wrote that "no plans have been made for soldier settlements in Indiana for the reason that there is no unoccupied land in the State and plans which might be feasible in other States would not be practical here."

Iowa.

Drafts of soldier-settlement bills were submitted by the secretary of state to the committee on agriculture of the senate, but no action seems to have been taken.

Kansas.

A concurrent resolution was introduced, to be voted upon at the general election in 1920, to amend the constitution of Kansas to create a fund to encourage the purchase, improvement, and ownership of agricultural lands and the occupancy and cultivation thereof, preference to be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Gov. Allen indorsed the soldier-settlement plan in his message to the legislature.

Kentucky.

The governor has appointed the following soldier-settlement committee to represent the State, the legislature not being in session until 1920: Dr. Frank L. McVey, chairman, Lexington; Harvey Chenault, Richmond; Owsley Brown, Louisville; W. A. Wickless, Greenville; W. F. Bradshaw, Paducah.

Louisiana.

It is understood, unofficially, that Gov. Pleasant wired the President asking his active support of Federal soldier-settlement legislation.

The governor has appointed the following soldier-settlement committee to represent the State: E. E. Lafaye, New Orleans; H. B. Bayliss, general manager, Association of Commerce, Lake Charles; Harry P. Gamble, New Orleans; W. R. Dodson, Baton Rouge.

The legislature convenes in May, 1920.

Maine.

The governor's message to the legislature urges cooperation with the United States in soldier settlement.

The legislature has enacted a bill (chapter 189), approved April 4, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, and appropriating "so much of the reserve land fund not otherwise invested as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The soldier-settlement board created by the act consists of the governor, the State auditor, the land agent and forest commissioner, the commissioner of agriculture, and the State superintendent of schools.

Maryland.

The general assembly does not meet until January, 1920. The governor has appointed the following committee to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: John M. Dennis (former State treasurer); Phillips Lee Goldsborough (former governor); Dr. A. F. Woods, president of the State College of Agriculture; C. S. Ucker, vice president Southern Settlement and Development Organization, Continental Building, Baltimore; William McKenney; William J. Frere; Samuel L. Byrn.

Massachusetts.

The governor indorsed the proposal of the reclamation of lands for returned soldiers in his message to the legislature.

Two bills were introduced (H. Doc. 290 and 818) and a merger bill (S. Doc. 371) was reported by the committee on reconstruction. This bill provides for

the creation of The Massachusetts Farm Settlement Corporation and for cooperation with the United States on soldier settlements. The bill carries an appropriation of \$500,000.

Michigan.

A soldier-settlement bill providing for cooperation with the United States was introduced in the legislature, but no action taken thereon.

The governor appointed a commission of 20 members "to formulate a general land settlement policy for our returning soldiers, sailors, and marines, and also for our industrial workers." This commission in its report of March 12, 1919, indorses the soldier-settlement plan of the Department of the Interior. A special committee of the commission later reported that "adequate laws were now in force to carry into effect the duties of a land settlement policy for the State of Michigan in harmony with the general suggestions in the report."

The Michigan reconstruction committee, appointed by the governor, submitted a report on March 11, 1919, recommending that "the State cooperate with the Department of the Interior in providing farms for returned soldiers and others desiring land."

It is understood that the governor has appointed a State-wide committee to act in soldier-settlement and reclamation matters, affiliated with the Lake States committee, representing Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan.

Minnesota.

A soldier-settlement bill was introduced in the legislature, providing for cooperation with the United States, but no action was taken thereon.

A bill was introduced providing for the organization of a State-colonization commission to supervise the colonization of lands, which also provides for cooperation with the Federal Government.

The governor appointed the following committee on land settlement for returning soldiers and industrial workers: D. A. Wallace, chairman, Duluth; Charles P. Craig, Duluth; C. G. Selvig; C. R. Middleton; E. F. Farmers.

The legislature adjourned on April 24.

It is understood that the governor has appointed a State-wide committee to act in soldier-settlement and reclamation matters, affiliated with the Lake States committee, representing Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan.

Mississippi.

The legislature meets in January, 1920.

The following committee has been appointed to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters, as the result of a State-wide meeting to formulate a policy: P. P. Garner, commissioner of agriculture, chairman, Jackson; C. T. Stevens, Hattiesburg; J. B. Lisk, Jackson; R. M. Weaver, Corinth; J. C. Seller, Yazoo City; Lamar Henington, Hattiesburg; M. S. Connor, Seminary; H. A. Camp, Hattiesburg.

Missouri.

The governor indorsed the soldier-settlement plan in his message to the general assembly on January 10, 1919.

The general assembly enacted a bill (S. No. 355), approved April, 1919, providing for soldier settlements in cooperation with the United States, and carrying an appropriation of \$10,000.

The general assembly also enacted a joint and concurrent resolution (No. 15), approved April, 1919, enabling the people to vote a bond issue of \$1,000,000 to constitute a revolving fund to provide funds to carry out the provisions of senate bill No. 355, above.

The soldier-settlement board is composed of the following: Dr. Brydon, commissioner of land reclamation, chairman, Jefferson City; Dean F. B. Mumford, director of the agricultural college, Columbia; Dean E. J. McCausland, director of the college of engineering, Columbia.

Montana.

The legislature enacted a bill (H. B. No. 130), approved March 11, 1919, providing for cooperation with the Federal Government in soldier settlements and carrying an appropriation of \$50,000.

The legislature also passed a bill (——) approved, appropriating \$200,000 for the relief of soldiers, containing a provision that the soldier-settlement act board may use such money as may be necessary from this appropriation in addition to the appropriation of \$50,000 above referred to.

Nebraska.

A soldier-settlement bill was introduced in the legislature, passed the house, but failed of passage in the senate, although its passage was urged by the governor.

The legislature has now adjourned.

Nevada.

The governor urged the passage of soldier-settlement legislation in his message to the legislature.

The legislature enacted a bill (assembly bill No. 219), approved March 28, 1919, providing for borrowing \$1,000,000 by the sale of bonds for the reclamation, improvement, and equipment of lands within the State for rural homes for soldiers, sailors, marines, and other loyal citizens; and providing for co-operation with the Federal Government.

New Hampshire.

So far as reported no action on soldier settlements has been taken by the legislature.

New Jersey.

On December 20, 1918, the governor wrote to Secretary Lane as follows:

"Let me assure you that New Jersey is very desirous of cooperating with you in your very commendable desire to meet this problem in every way possible, and you may be sure that every resource of the State will be placed at your disposal."

A bill (assembly, No. 38) was introduced in the legislature providing for a State land settlement board and carrying an appropriation of \$300,000 for the purchase of lands to be divided into small farms and for the establishment of farm colonies. No action was taken on this bill.

The legislature passed a bill (S. No. 5), approved March 26, 1919, creating a State employment bureau, with power, among other things, to secure farm homes for soldiers and sailors.

Appropriation was made to permit the State department of conservation and development to create a land registration bureau to assist in the placing of men on available land.

New Mexico.

The legislature passed a joint memorial (No. 6) urging the adoption by Congress of soldier-settlement legislation.

The legislature enacted a bill (H. B. No. 204), approved March, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, making an appropriation of \$30,000 and one-half the proceeds derived from the rentals or sales of certain State lands. The members of the soldier-settlement board are: Edward Everett Young, chairman, Santa Fe; Leslie M. Gillett, State engineer; Dr. A. D. Crille, president of the State college.

New York.

Two bills (senate No. 417 and assembly No. 615) were introduced in the legislature providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements. Each bill carried an appropriation of \$250,000. The legislature adjourned without taking action.

Charles L. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture, department of farms and markets, Albany, through his farm service bureau, furnishes advice to returned soldiers regarding farming possibilities in the State, and puts them in touch with good farms now on the market.

North Carolina.

A soldier-settlement bill was introduced in the legislature, but no action was taken prior to adjournment.

It is understood that the legislature passed a resolution urging the passage of soldier-settlement legislation by Congress.

The following committee has been appointed by the governor to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: George Herbert Smith, Wilmington; Capt. George T. Leach, Washington; J. R. Page, Aberdeen.

North Dakota.

A bill (H. B. No. 123) was introduced in the legislature providing for cooperation in soldier settlements with the United States and carrying an appropriation of \$200,000 as a soldier-settlement and immigration fund, but no action was taken prior to adjournment.

The legislature passed a bill (H. B. No. 128), approved March 6, 1919, providing for a "Returned Soldier Fund" to enable returned soldiers to secure a home or a farm home, etc., each soldier being entitled to \$25 a month for each month or fraction of a month he was in the service.

Ohio.

On March 11, 1919, the governor wrote to Secretary Lane as follows:

"You can depend upon our State giving you its maximum cooperation in furtherance of your plan to bring about a soldiers' movement to the soil."

No action taken by the legislature on soldier-settlement legislation.

Oklahoma.

A bill (S. 11) was introduced in the legislature providing for soldier settlements in cooperation with the United States, but action on it has been deferred awaiting action by Congress.

It is understood that the legislature passed a joint resolution memorializing Congress in favor of the enactment of soldier-settlement legislation.

The legislature passed the home ownership bill, under which the State can loan to men who desire to go on the land and make their home, practically all of the purchase price of the land.

Oregon.

The legislature passed a joint resolution (No. 16) memorializing Congress in favor of a soldier-settlement bill.

The legislature enacted a bill (S. B. 147), filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, creating the Oregon Land Settlement Commission, and making an appropriation of \$50,000. The secretary and manager of the commission is William H. Crawford, 605 Oregon Building, Portland, Oreg.

The legislature enacted a bill (S. B. 266), filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1919, referring to the people at a special election to be held June 3, 1919, the question of authorizing the sale of bonds in the amount of \$2,647,000 for soldier settlement and general reclamation in cooperation with the United States.

Pennsylvania.

The secretary of state writes on April 21 that no soldier-settlement bills have been introduced in the legislature.

On May 29, F. D. Beary, adjutant general, Harrisburg, wrote as follows:

"No committees or commissions have been appointed in connection with the soldier-settlement problem. We have, however, in the State a welfare commission, consisting of the governor, lieutenant governor, auditor general, state treasurer, and adjutant general, and any question of this kind could be taken up under the law by them, and they could apply funds in their possession for such a purpose if deemed advisable."

South Carolina.

The general assembly on February 19, 1919, passed two concurrent resolutions (H. 548-S. 560, and H. 555), urging the enactment by Congress of soldier-settlement legislation.

A soldier-settlement bill (S. 49) was introduced.

The general appropriation bill (calendar No. 466), contains a provision "that the commissioner of agriculture, commerce and industries be, and he hereby is, authorized to cooperate with the Federal Government, through its agents, in the so-called soldier-settlement work, and that the said commissioner be authorized to gather statistics and to do other such work as now provided by law, for the purpose of getting options, if necessary, upon the untenanted lands of the State available for colonization and development."

The governor has appointed the following commission to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: R. N. Lathan, chairman, Charleston; William Gifford, Gifford; W. H. Andrews, Andrews; E. W. Durant, Charleston; Joseph Shank, Georgetown.

South Dakota.

The legislature has enacted a bill (S. B. No. 255), approved March, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, making an appropriation of \$100,000, and authorizing a bond issue of \$1,000,000.

Tennessee.

The legislature enacted a bill (H. B. 447), approved April 16, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements. Under the provisions of the act the governor has appointed the following soldier-settlement commission: Dr. H. A. Morgan, dean of the agricultural department, University of Tennessee; F. M. McRee, commissioner of agriculture; Wilbur A. Nelson, State geologist; W. R. Manier, secretary Nashville Commercial Club; George N. Welch, railroad commissioner.

It is understood that the legislature passed a joint resolution memorializing Congress in favor of soldier-settlement legislation.

Texas.

The legislature enacted a bill referring to the people a constitutional amendment so that the State may lend its credit for land and settlement purposes. This amendment was voted upon favorably May 24, 1919. The attorney general is preparing a measure for State and Federal cooperation.

It is understood that a joint resolution has been passed by the legislature memorializing Congress in favor of soldier-settlement legislation.

The following committee has been appointed by the governor to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: Stewart R. Smith, chairman, Beaumont; J. H. Haile, vice chairman, San Antonio; R. H. Spencer, secretary, Houston; Senator A. C. Buchanan, Temple; Senator F. M. Givson, Bonham.

Utah.

The legislature enacted a bill (S. B. No. 79), approved March 17, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements and appropriating \$25,000.

The legislature also enacted a bill (S. B. No. 80), approved March 17, 1919, providing for a bond issue of \$1,000,000, the proceeds of which are to be covered into the soldier-settlement fund.

The governor has appointed the following soldier-settlement commission: W. R. Wallace, chairman, Salt Lake City; George McGonagle, State engineer; Dr. E. G. Peterson, president Utah Agricultural College, Logan.

Vermont.

The general assembly enacted a bill (No. 15), approved March 26, 1919, in which it is provided that "the commissioner of agriculture is authorized and directed to confer with the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of securing the assistance of the Federal Government in placing returned soldiers on farms in this State, and he shall obtain for the State its proper share of any appropriation made by Congress to assist such returned soldiers to engage in the farming industry."

Virginia.

The governor has appointed the following committee to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: T. W. Carrington, chairman, Richmond; John C. Easley, Richmond; Oliver J. Sands, Richmond; I. Walke Truxton, Norfolk;

Tench F. Tilghman, Norfolk; A. B. Schwarzkopf, Norfolk; Walter Edward Harris, Petersburg; D. S. Jones, Newport News; Lee Long, Dante; J. William Ridley, Courtland; J. E. Nottingham, jr., Franktown; A. T. Moore, Staunton; A. E. Anderson, Bristol; John F. Kolar, Disputanta; W. R. Warren, Bacons Castle.

Washington.

The legislature enacted a bill (H. B. 200), approved March 18, 1919, known as the State reclamation act, creating a State reclamation revolving fund to eventually attain a total of \$5,000,000, and appropriating \$1,050,000.

The legislature also enacted a bill (S. B. 184), approved March 20, 1919, known as the land-settlement act, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, and making an appropriation of \$150,000 from the State reclamation revolving fund and \$10,000 from the general fund.

West Virginia.

A bill was introduced in the legislature providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, but no action was taken on it.

The legislature passed a resolution memorializing Congress in favor of the enactment of soldier-settlement legislation.

The governor has appointed the following commission to represent the State in soldier-settlement matters: J. B. McLaughlin, Strange Creek; Merrett Wilson, Elkins; Howard Gore, Clarksburg.

Wisconsin.

The governor has appointed a State-wide committee to act in soldier-settlement and reclamation matters, affiliated with the Lake States committee representing Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan.

On February 23, 1918, the legislature passed a joint resolution (S. No. 8) appointing a commission to report "a comprehensive social and economic welfare program of reconstruction after the war to include civilians whose status has been affected by the war as well as soldiers." In the report of the commission on February 5, 1919, it is recommended that hearty cooperation be given the effort "now being made by the Federal Government to establish a national land-settlement policy."

The following bills have been introduced: S. No. 184, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements; S. No. 294, providing for a colonization board for the development and settlement of land; S. No. 459, providing for a land-settlement board for the development and settlement of land; A. No. 614, providing for a land-settlement board for the development and settlement of land.

Wyoming.

The legislature enacted a bill (S. No. 70), approved February 28, 1919, providing for cooperation with the United States in soldier settlements, appropriating \$5,000, and authorizing the land-settlement board to loan not to exceed \$200,000 from the State school funds to bona fide settlers for essential farm improvements. The land-settlement board is composed of the governor, the State treasurer, and the secretary of State.

EXHIBIT C.

MICHIGAN LAND-SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.

The plan of Secretary Lane strikes right at the very vitals of the principal causes of the movement from the country to the cities, when it is proposed to set up "community centers" in which the social and educational advantages shall be of first consideration. Efficient and economical crop production, coupled with improved market facilities are, of course, prime elements and are specifically covered in the general plan. In other words, folks have left the farm because their net earnings were less than obtained in the city and because the rural social and educational advantages have been vastly less appealing than in towns. Scientific group settlement will go a long way in correcting these conditions.

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

The American Federation of Labor makes the following recommendation in its reconstruction program:

Legislation also should be enacted which will give the Nation's defenders the opportunity for easy and ready access to the land. Favorable inducements should be provided for them to enter agriculture and husbandry. The Government should assume the responsibility for the allotment of such lands, and supply the necessary capital for its development and cultivation, with such safeguards as will protect both the Government and the discharged soldier and sailor.

THE KERN COUNTY SERVICE MEN'S ASSOCIATION.

A letter from this association is as follows:

We inclose herewith a petition which was drawn up and circulated by this organization, and to which are affixed 300 signatures.

By this petition we aim to express our willingness to accept the opportunities that will be presented to service men when the Lane land-settlement bill is passed.

In addition to these signatures, our organization has circulated 250 of the card applications issued by the Department of the Interior, which were forwarded to us at our request. We understand these cards are being filled out and returned to your department.

The Kern County Service Men's Association, representing Kern County's former service men, would be appreciative of any information or advice with which you might wish to favor us in connection with the proposed land-settlement act.

The petition is as follows:

"The undersigned, each of whom was inducted into the United States service and who holds certificate of honorable discharge therefrom, the respective dates of which appear following our respective names, together with our respective ages and whether single or married, hereby declare our desire to secure the soldiers' homestead privilege and elect to exercise such privilege on unoccupied, idle, undeveloped, and unreclaimed lands in Kern Delta, Kern County, Calif., which said lands, however, we are advised, are in private ownership and we respectfully seek the privilege of selecting a body of land as nearly as may be in compact area and in sufficient area to enable allotment of 60 acres to each applicant, the price and terms of purchase to be fixed by the State, on a basis that will enable, with intelligent and industrious application, the acquisition of title within a reasonable time and a substantial livelihood from the beginning.

"We further express our desire and willingness to join the State and Federal authorities on a reasonable wage basis, pending reclamation, to construct and install the necessary irrigating canals and other water-supply facilities, drainage facilities where required, installation of electrical service agencies, building of permanent roads to trade centers, and the doing of such other work in the premises as the Government policy may require, prior to allotment.

"We further signify our desire to secure a range homestead from the public lands of the United States to be operated in connection with the valley holding."

(Names of 300 signers to the petition.)

THE WASHINGTON COMMITTEE, AGRICULTURAL SECTION, DIVISION OF TRAFFIC, UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION.

This committee heartily indorses the plans as suggested by Secretary Lane for the purpose of furnishing occupation to the returning soldiers and for the preparation by reclamation or otherwise of farms or ranches to be sold to soldiers and selected settlers upon the most favorable terms and conditions. Resolution carried.

THE OREGON COMMITTEE OF THE SAME ORGANIZATION.

Resolved, That this committee desires to indorse and offer its cooperation to the plans as suggested by Secretary Lane for the preparation of homes for the returning soldiers by means of reclamation or other methods of development and further indorses those portions of Secretary Lane's plans which

offer an opportunity for the employment of returned soldiers in the development of these reclamation or other projects fostered by the Government for the purpose of preparing the land for such use. That this committee further approves the ideas of Secretary Lane that any homes prepared by the National or State Governments shall be sold to these returned soldiers and other selected settlers upon the most favorable terms and conditions.

BOISE COUNCIL NO. 899, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS.

Whereas it is fit and becoming that a grateful Nation, looking to the welfare of its returning heroes from the field, the camp, and the high seas, should provide in a substantial manner for the recognition of the noble services of our soldiers, sailors, and marines: Therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) That it is the sentiment of Boise Council No. 899, Knights of Columbus, that there is no more fitting and appropriate way of achieving this most meritorious result than to follow the suggestions of the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, in the reclamation of the arid lands of southern Idaho and the logged-over lands of northern Idaho, for settlement and ultimate acquisition by our returning soldiers, sailors, and marines, upon such terms and conditions as will enable them to reclaim and bring to a high state of cultivation the lands thus settled upon, without exacting conditions that would deter the ordinarily prudent man from assuming the obligations incident to settlement on those lands.

(2) That it is our opinion that no more suitable lands can be obtained than the potentially productive lands of southern Idaho and the rich logged-over lands of northern Idaho to bring about the greatest and most beneficial results to returning soldiers, sailors, and marines to the State of Idaho and to the United States of America.

(3) That we indorse the proposal that all work incidental to the reclamation of these lands wherein man power is required be allotted to soldier, sailor, and marine applicants for land and to men who may be displaced from their usual occupations in civil life by the preferential employment of former soldiers, sailors, and marines.

(4) That we believe that the reclamation of the arid and logged-over lands of Idaho under the wise and careful administration of the Secretary of the Interior will not only relieve the situation with respect to employment, but the development of these large areas of land will contribute to national prosperity and the beneficial influence thereof will be felt by all the people of the United States.

(5) That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, to both Houses of Congress, and to each member of the Idaho delegation in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

ARIZONA CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Whereas the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association desires the largest possible extension of the irrigated area of Arizona and the full conservation and utilization of all the water resources of the State, both surface and underground, including the complete control of flood waters, and the protection of farms and grazing lands from soil wash and erosion, and the channels of rivers and canals from the silt resulting from farm-land destruction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., February 11, 12, and 13, 1919, heartily indorses the plans of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of large areas of land in Arizona for settlement by returned soldiers, sailors, and war workers, as well as by others who may desire to settle upon such reclaimed lands, and urges that the appropriations recommended by the Secretary of the Interior for that purpose should be made without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urges the appointment of the commission created by the Newlands river regulation amendment enacted by the Congress of the United States in August 17, 1917, and the immediate preparation by and through such commission of a comprehensive plan for flood control and river regulations on every watershed in Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urges the construction, without delay, of the Upper Gila, San Carlos, Camp Verde, Horseshoe, Charleston, Sentinel, and Parker Reservoirs, and all other practicable irrigation projects and reservoirs for flood-water storage in Arizona to the end that the benefits to the manu-

facturing industries of the United States resulting from the work of the Reclamation Service may be extended at this time to the fullest possible extent, to create employment for labor and home markets for manufacturers, and thereby check the tendency to disemployment and business depression resulting from the cessation of war industries; and be it further

Resolved, That in the selection of lands for soldiers, sailors, and war workers we believe the State land commission should safeguard the rights of those who have served the Nation, assist them in the selection of desirable lands, and enable them to locate on such lands without being subject to unnecessary expense.

THE NATIONAL SERVICE LEGION, NEW YORK.

Resolved, That the National Service Legion indorse the reclamation project ("land for the soldiers") adopted by the Department of the Interior and, furthermore, that the speaking staff of the legion be placed at the disposal of the Government to assist in procuring a successful outcome of the proposed plans.

THE ENGINEERS' CLUB OF BALTIMORE.

Whereas information from reliable sources indicate that there are now out of employment in the United States about 500,000 workers, many of whom have but recently laid aside the uniform of their country; and

Whereas competent students of social and economic conditions inform us that the country is in great need of the addition of a million homes owned by the occupants, to insure us properly against the evils of social unrest; and

Whereas the growth of population in the United States is greatly exceeding in celerity the growth in the production of agricultural crops; and

Whereas the men who have borne the arms of the United States are particularly entitled to receive at the hands of a grateful country every reasonable opportunity for advancement that may properly be extended to them; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, has proposed a plan to provide both employment and farm homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines, through the reclamation by and for them of undeveloped lands throughout the country and the division of such lands into communities of farm homes fully improved with fences and buildings, and equipped with stock and farm implements, for immediate use, the cost of which shall be returned to the United States in small payments over a term of years; and

Whereas this plan received the approval of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, in his message to Congress, December 2, 1918, and of Theodore Roosevelt, in his article "Eyes to the Front," appearing in the February, 1919, number of the Metropolitan Magazine, as well as that of thousands of other thoughtful citizens from all parts of the land; and

Whereas there is pending before Congress a bill (H. R. 13651) providing for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to put this plan into effect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Engineers' Club of Baltimore, Md., hereby expresses its earnest approval of the plan of Secretary Lane, and urges the passage of the bill above referred to; and, furthermore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland to do all in their power to further the passage of said bill and its enactment into law.

CONFERENCE OF SOUTHWESTERN STATES.

At a conference called by the Hon. Simon Bamberger, governor of the State of Utah, to meet at Salt Lake City, Utah, on the 18th day of January, 1919, for the consideration of plans for soldiers, sailors, and marines' settlement along the lines suggested by Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, the States of California, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah were represented by delegates duly appointed by the governors of said States.

The conference met, pursuant to call at the Utah State capitol, and as a result of its deliberations adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the world is just emerging from the greatest war in history; and

"Whereas it is of prime importance to the people of the United States that the returning soldiers, sailors, and marines of the country be given profitable employment, with the opportunity to acquire homes throughout the United

States upon lands which it is possible to reclaim by the concerted action of the Federal Government and the various States of the Union; and

"Whereas the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, has suggested the cooperation of the United States with the various States looking to the reclamation, redemption, and improvement of lands throughout the United States and the settlement thereon of soldiers, sailors, and marines under terms which should prove attractive to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference heartily approves the general principles suggested by Secretary Lane and urges upon the legislatures of the various States of the Union and upon the Congress of the United States immediate action looking to the crystallization in the form of laws of such provisions as will make possible at the earliest moment the furnishing of employment to the soldiers and sailors of the country on projects looking to the reclamation of all such lands as may be made productive by the construction of irrigation works, the drainage of swamp lands, and the clearing of cut-over timberlands, with a view of placing upon such lands such soldiers, sailors, marines, and citizens as may desire to avail themselves of the opportunity so offered."

In this connection we call attention to the experience of our country in various completed reclamation projects throughout the land and point out that it is not sufficient merely to place the men upon the land. We therefore urge upon those in authority that lands which may be reclaimed by any of the methods above suggested should be brought to a point where the settler going upon them can immediately enter upon actual farming with a promise of results at the end of the first season of his occupancy. He should be offered lands ready to plant and equipped with the necessary buildings, implements, and live stock to make it a going concern, all of these to be paid for on long-time deferred payments bearing a low rate of interest.

As representing States lying within the arid region of the West, we call attention to the fact that in such region there are vast areas of land which only need the application of available water to make them productive and capable of supporting hundreds of thousands of inhabitants. As an illustration of this condition we call attention to the great drainage basin of the Colorado River, in which there are in excess of 3,000,000 acres which can be reclaimed by the construction of reservoirs for the conservation of the flood waters of the stream, which would do away with flood damages on the lower reaches of the river and bring into productivity an empire which in its richness would rival the lands of the far-famed Delta of the Nile, an empire which when fully developed would add to the wealth of the country by a variety of crops ranging from those of the North Temperate Zone to those semitropical products of Arizona and California.

In the treatment of projects such as are to be found on the Colorado River and its tributaries, those in authority should bear in mind that the stream should be treated as a whole in order that the greatest duty of its waters will be obtained. The history of irrigation throughout the world has shown that the greatest duty of water is had by first using it upon the upper reaches of the stream and continuing the use progressively downward. In other words, "the water should first be captured and used while it is young," for it can then be recaptured as it returns from the performance of its duties and thus be used over and over again. Attention is further directed to the fact that many of these irrigation projects, of a magnitude to be developed only by the Federal Government, can be properly carried on without interfering with smaller developments which should be undertaken by individual and corporate initiative, and we therefore urge upon the Interior and Agricultural Departments the adoption of a liberal and sympathetic policy in the granting of rights of way for reservoirs and ditches upon the public domain where the same are essential to the development of such private projects. We further urge the liberal administration of all of the land laws of the United States, looking to the end of placing the lands of the United States in the actual possession and occupation of its citizens in order that the citizens may have a home and that the lands may go upon the tax rolls of the various States in which they may be located in order that they may bear their just proportion of the expense of State administration.

Along the lines set forth in these resolutions we pledge ourselves to a hearty cooperation with the representatives of the Federal Government in order that the desired end may be attained at the earliest possible moment consistent with a wise administration of the affairs of the Nation and of the States.

While the States here represented are but slightly concerned in the reclamation of swamp lands or cut-over timberlands, we express our hearty approval of legislation looking to the redemption and proper utilization of such lands, for it is to the home-owning class that our country must look for the preservation of our traditions and our institutions.

In the carrying out of all reclamation projects in which the Federal Government may become interested its activities should ever be in conformity with the laws of the State in which the project under development is located. In the arid States of the West the irrigation projects undertaken by or with the aid of the Federal Government should in every instance be based upon a full compliance with the laws of the State wherein the projects are located so far as the appropriation of water and other matters of purely State control are concerned.

WILLIAM SPRY, *Chairman.*
OTIS J. BAUGHN, *Secretary.*

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT REGARDING RESOLUTIONS OF DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS
REGARDING SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMENS' CLUBS,
TEXAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

May 14, 1919.

Farms for soldiers.

Whereas we believe in the project of the Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, to give to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines the opportunity to own land upon which he may live and make a living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the ——— district of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs pledges its support to Secretary Lane in furthering the "Farms for Soldiers" project, and we urge that in the plans for the community center and for the homes on the farm careful attention be given to the needs of the women, that their surroundings may be conducive to happiness and contentment.

OMAHA WOMAN'S CLUB.

May 8, 1919.

Farms for soldiers.

Whereas we believe in the project of the Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, to give to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines the opportunity to own land upon which they may live and make a living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the second district of the Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs pledges its support to Secretary Lane in furthering the "Farms for Soldiers" project, and we urge that in the plans for the community center and for the homes on the farm careful attention be given to the needs of the women, that their surroundings may be conducive to happiness and content.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The Daughters of the American Revolution at their Twenty-eighth Continental Congress of the national society passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution proffer to the Secretary of the Interior their hearty cooperation in and their cordial approval of his efforts toward the promotion of Americanization and the eradication of illiteracy, and that we urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will permit these problems to be undertaken in a way which their importance to the future of the country demands; and be it further

Resolved, That an authenticated copy of the foregoing resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Whereas of our great Army of patriotic sons now being rapidly demobilized many are unable to secure the employment necessary for them to make needed provision for themselves and their families; and

Whereas the safety and well-being of our country rests in great measure upon the stability of the home, which in turn depends largely upon ownership of the home by the occupant; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, has proposed a program to provide both work and homes for our fighting boys by reclaiming undeveloped lands, dividing these lands into projects of farm homes, and permitting the soldiers to secure these homes by paying the actual cost in easy payments over a period of 40 years; and

Whereas more than 30,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines have already written to the Department of the Interior asking for the privilege of taking advantage of Secretary Lane's plan; and

Whereas this plan has received widespread approval from economists and patriots throughout the country, including the President of the United States and the late Col. Theodore Roosevelt; and

Whereas the United States is now the only large country among the Allies that has not made provision to meet the demand of the troops for farm homes; and

Whereas a bill providing an appropriation to carry this plan into effect was reported favorably out of a committee in each House of the Sixty-fifth Congress, but failed to be reached for consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution, in annual convention assembled, in the city of Washington, D. C., hereby approve the plan of Secretary Lane and urge the special session of Congress soon to be convened speedily to pass a bill under which it may put into effect, without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That an authenticated copy of the foregoing resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

May 9, 1919.

The department of superintendence of the National Education Association indorses the bill now pending before Congress appropriating \$100,000,000 with which to provide work and homes for our soldier boys.

THE NEW JERSEY STATE COUNCIL OF DEFENSE,

May 7, 1919.

Be it resolved by the executive committee of the New Jersey Council of Defense, That the proposal of Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to procure a loan from the United States Government to the amount of \$100,000,000 for land development for returning soldiers and sailors, by creating farms through the reclamation of arid lands in the West, the draining of swamp lands in the South, and the clearing of lands in every State where possible, is hereby approved and indorsed, in so far as the general purposes and general provisions of such plan are concerned, by the said executive committee of the New Jersey State Council of Defense; and

Be it further resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to enact such laws and appropriate the necessary moneys to execute such plan, as aforesaid, for the purpose of reclaiming such lands in the interest of soldiers and sailors of the United States and for the purpose of ultimately providing for such soldiers and sailors homes and lands.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded at once to Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States of America.

Passed by the executive committee of the New Jersey State Council of Defense this 7th day of May, 1919.

JOHN REGAN POST OF WORLD WAR VETERANS,

April 21, 1919.

Resolution.

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States, commonly known as the soldiers' settlement act, or the Lane Land Bill, providing for the reclamation of a vast acreage of arid, cut-over, and swamp-lands in the United States, and for the furnishing of homes and employment

for soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Great War; and whereas we believe that the greatest question confronting the United States during the reconstruction period after the war is the adequate development of its vast resources and the furnishing of employment for the many citizens whose participation in the war or in war industries threw them out of their former occupations and employment; and whereas the said soldiers' settlement act failed to pass at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the John Regan Post of the World War Veterans as follows: That we deeply appreciate the efforts of the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and of our delegation in Congress to secure the passage of such bill; that we are heartily in favor of the enactment of such legislation as will assist returning soldiers, sailors, and marines in the securing of rural homes and suitable employment and in reclaiming the 5,000,000 acres of arid, swamp, and cut-over lands in the State of Idaho, which can be reclaimed at a reasonable cost; and that we strongly urge our Senators and Representatives at the next session of the Congress of the United States to devote their utmost endeavors to securing the introduction and passage of said soldiers' settlement bill or similar legislation.

And be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, the Hon. William E. Borah, the Hon. John F. Nugent, the Hon. Addison T. Smith, and the Hon. Burton L. French.

The caucus of the American Legion at St. Louis in May, 1919, unanimously indorsed the plan for providing farms for returned soldiers, sailors, and marines.

EXHIBIT D.

[Department of the Interior; Franklin K. Lane, Secretary. U. S. Reclamation Service; Arthur P. Davis, Director.]

SUMMARY OF SOLDIER SETTLEMENTS IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES.

By ELWOOD MEAD, Consulting Engineer, U. S. Reclamation Service.

Foreword.—The following summary of soldier-settlement legislation of other countries is published to help the people of this Nation understand and deal with one of the reconstruction problems which confronts us. The laws have special value because in most countries they are the outgrowth of several years' experience, prior to the war, with a rural development under which land was bought, subdivided, improved, and sold to settlers on long-time payments. Provision for soldier settlement required, therefore, only the broadening of a system of laws and policies already in operation.

One important feature of these laws is the provision for cooperation between the Federal and State authorities in Canada and Australia, and, generally speaking, between the central Government and the local authorities.

It will be noticed that Australia, which has an area about equal to the United States, has a comprehensive scheme for cooperation between the Commonwealth Government and the several State governments, under which the States provide the land and the Federal Government provides the money for reclamation, where this is necessary, and for financing the improvement and equipment for farms. Such cooperation makes the movement truly national because it enlists all sections of the country and mobilizes in the service of soldiers public agencies which have the practical and technical knowledge needed to secure the desired results with the least effort, money, and time.

It is believed that this cooperation should be the outstanding feature of our legislation. If the movement is to be national in the fullest sense, every State should provide opportunities for its sons and should contribute to the expense and share in the direction of the movement. If this plan is followed, State legislation is as necessary as Federal legislation and both ought to be enacted this winter.

It is hoped the facts herein stated will help to show the character of the legislation required and the extent of the work to be done if we are to meet our responsibilities as other English-speaking countries are meeting theirs.

Legislation, administration, and appropriations.—All English-speaking countries except the United States have passed special soldier settlement legislation and made appropriations therefor. Where good free land exists this is offered the soldier, but even when such exists he is usually given assistance in the

individual purchase of private land, or such private land is purchased by the State in blocks. In countries like England, New Zealand, Victoria, and New South Wales it is largely a question of resuming land.

When land-settlement boards do not already exist they have had to be created, except in the case of Ontario and some of the other Canadian Provinces, which are using their minister of lands, their agricultural, and forestry departments for this purpose.

Handling applications and placing soldiers is largely decentralized and in the hands of voluntary local committees.

The English and Canadian method of settlement is to establish central farms on which to try out crops, to employ and train settlers, stock them with animals and implements for the use of the settlers, and about these farms to lay out farm blocks of varying dimensions. The Australian plan is to follow the policy of closer settlement already laid down and so successfully prosecuted.

Explicit data concerning total appropriations are not available. The usual method is to start the work with a small appropriation and to add to it as required. In the case of Canadian Provinces and the Dominion, funds come from an appropriation for general development, probably derived from taxation; in England it is a disbursement from the treasury; in New Zealand and Australia the funds are derived wholly from the sale of bonds in the London market.

Respective spheres of State and Federal action.—In the two countries where a Federal Government exists, namely, Canada and Australia, tentative steps have been taken toward working out a cooperative plan the general nature of which is for the general Government to supply the funds for loan advances and for the States to supply the land and to supervise its division, and maybe control. A general board has been appointed in each case and on which each of the States or Provinces is represented. Undoubtedly when the period of demobilization approaches this plan in the case of Canada and Australia will be carried out in great detail.

Kind and amount of aid.—Aid to the soldier takes a variety of forms. There are, first, the allowances which are given a soldier for himself and family in the probationary period of working and beginning of experience; under this head might be mentioned transportation, which all of the countries offer the soldiers when they are traveling to training stations or to the land; second, either the giving of land or the pricing it to the soldier at the cost of purchase and subdivision; third, the supplying of advice, guidance, and instructions by all countries; fourth, the supply of grading, farm tools, and sometimes farm animals free or at cost (under this head may be mentioned the supply of seeds and fertilizers); fifth, credit advances for the taking up of mortgages and incumbrances, for clearing, leveling, and ditching of lands, for erection of fences, buildings, barns and houses, for the building of homes; sixth, assistance in the organizations of cooperative buying and selling associations, and the giving of whatever aid the State Governments ought to give in this direction.

In every instance the payments for the purchase of the land or for the reimbursement to the State for advances are stretched over a long period of time. The period of payment varies from 20 years, as in the case of Ontario, to 36½ years, which is the case in the Australian States. Advances for stock and developments are repayable in from 10 to 25 years. The interest charged is seldom more than ½ cent more than the interest paid on public securities.

Types of land tenure.—In Canada freehold rights prevail. In England the perpetual lease predominates. In New Zealand both the lease and the freehold are given. In Australia some of the States, such as New South Wales, South Australia, and Queensland, do not give a freehold title. The occupier pays a rent of about 1½ per cent of the capital value of the land and receives a perpetual lease, which is inheritable and, under certain restrictions, transferable. The other States offer a freehold title or a lease. The governments of all these countries are not inclined to part with their grazing lands or lands that are suitable for further subdivisions. They are usually leased for short or long terms.

In nearly all cases, while the soldier is not legally required to maintain a residence, he can not lease his land or transfer it within a stated period, and he can not meet his payments on the advances received unless he is giving his whole attention to his land. Residence, therefore, is practically assured.

Selection and training of soldiers.—The selection of soldiers and the advice they receive is largely in the hands of local committees in the case of Canada,

England, and Australia. Such local committees are usually expected to give their advice in the selection of lands to be purchased by the State.

Some training of the soldier in agriculture, and some practical farm experience is always expected. Such training and experience are obtainable from three sources: Employment on farms, from agricultural colleges, or from farms associated with the colony enterprise.

Progress of soldier settlements.—The legislative acts in all countries are practically complete. The organization for the administration of the acts is largely completed. Some private lands have been purchased and public lands set aside by all of the English-speaking countries.

It is not possible at this time to give a table of the amount of land so acquired.

Note on the cooperation of public and private interest in land settlement for soldiers.

European countries, in contrast to English-speaking countries, where State action largely prevails in land settlement, have developed a policy of State cooperation with private societies. This is notably true in the cases of France, Holland, Norway, and Sweden. Private societies which are created for the building of houses, purchase of acre farms, or the subdivision of large estates usually sell their securities in the money market, realizing very small margins of profit, but also supplementing their funds by those received from the State. They also derive benefit and create their reserve capital by means of share membership. Even if they depend wholly upon State funds these private societies relieve the State of a large administration expense.

In Sweden there are three classes of such associations, national, provincial, and local, 17 in all. These associations are given about a million crowns a year for their several purposes.

The real estate credit societies for small holdings and dwelling houses are composed of five elements: Private individuals, savings banks, public benevolent institutions, commissions and departments, and the State. They are aggregations of public and private funds devoted to a social purpose. The savings banks can not only invest in these societies, but it is of greater advantage for them than to loan to individuals. The commissions and departments not only take bonds and shares; they guarantee the share dividends, but also the interest. Through the various agencies a society with 25,000 francs of paid-up capital may make advances on a total real estate value of 625,000 francs.

These agricultural lending societies in France have been given the task of purchasing small rural properties for soldiers and civilian victims of the war in a law signed April 9 by President Poincaré. The law provides in part: "Individual mortgage loans to facilitate the acquisition, parceling out, transformation, and reconstruction of small rural properties of which the value does not exceed 10,000 francs."

GREAT BRITAIN.

Legislation and appropriation.—Thus far England has done little more than experiment with land settlement for the soldier. There has been much agitation and legislation for small holdings, but without achieving very satisfactory results. Since the beginning of the operation of the small holdings act (1911) for the purchase of small acreage through the county councils there is said to have been an actual decrease of 5,500 holdings of 50 acres or under in England and Wales. The statement has also been made that of the 15,000 small holders who rent or have purchased through the councils only 774 have had newly equipped farms; the remainder have had to shift for themselves. This result is not promising, considering the fact that £5,250,000 has been advanced to the councils out of public funds for the purchase and adaptation. For the councils it may be said their advances are being repaid, and their losses are negligible. The councils have not used the credit, banking, cooperative transit, and market facility clause of the act. They have insisted that the applicant have a capital of at least £5 per acre of land leased or purchased. This requirement has eliminated most laborers. Although the Board of Agriculture has the authority to go forward with the development of small holdings if the council in question does not act, the Soldiers and Sailors Land Committee of the Board of Agriculture has decided that settlements of soldiers under this act is not feasible. The failure in the main seems to be due to the lethargy of the councils.

By act of Parliament (6 and 7 Geo. V, 38) the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries is enabled to acquire land for a small number of experimental holdings. Four of such areas for subdivision, comprising 6,000 acres, the maximum permitted under the act, have been purchased or leased, three in England and one in Wales. These will be described later. Recently a bill has been introduced in British Parliament authorizing the purchase of 60,000 acres of land in England and 20,000 acres of land in Scotland to provide homes for returning soldiers. This is ten times the area originally authorized to be bought. In addition, large areas of land in Scotland have been given to the Government to be subdivided into farms and leased to returning soldiers.

The departmental committee appointed by the president of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to study and propose settlement plans asked for an appropriation of £2,000,000.

Administration.—Settlement of soldiers in England and Wales comes under the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. In Scotland the Board of Agriculture is operating under the same act.

The kind and amount of aid.—The land.—Assistance to soldiers has taken the form of colonies. Four of these have been established to date by the Soldiers and Sailors Land Committee. The colonies to be developed were planned to accommodate about 100 families, each of which is to have from 10 to 25 acres, according to the character of the farming. Two of the colonies have been obtained on a 99-year lease at a yearly rental. The other two were purchased. They vary in size from 1,000 to 1,345 acres. Each of these colonies is to have an administration farm of about 250 acres, on which stock and implements are maintained for the use of the small holders. However, the division of the assets has, up to the last information, not been accomplished.

Credit.—The English plan does not contemplate extensive credit to the occupiers of these colonies. The board expects to supply opportunities for work and to improve the small holdings in a way to make them yield at an early date a support for the settler and his family. Such cash as may be needed for the purchase of stock may be had from the cooperative credit bank to be established under the partnership of the State. There are also to be accommodations in the way of stock and implements at the central farm.

Land tenure.—In line with the traditions of British agriculture, the Soldiers and Sailors Committee favors tenantry rather than ownership. The reasons given are: First, that for the State supervision and control it is best; second, to the small holder tenantry offers greater mobility and freedom of movement; third, less capital is needed by them in the case of a lease of large areas than the purchase of small holdings. The English small farmer does not, it is claimed, care for ownership. During the seven years the small holdings act has been in force there have been no applications for purchase.

The selection and training of soldiers.—Discharged soldiers of the Army who desire to farm are expected to work at least a year on one of these colonies before taking up the small holding.

Progress of land settlement.—Very recent information is not at hand regarding the progress of land settlement. The four colonies have not yet been fully established. It is understood, however, that the Soldiers and Sailors Committee is preparing to make recommendations for a considerable extension of colony settlement.

CANADA.

The Dominion Government.

Legislation and appropriation.—A soldier settlement of three members was appointed in February, 1918, following upon the act of August 29, 1917, called an "Act to assist returned soldiers in settling upon the land and to increase agricultural production." The essential features of this act are the bestowal of agricultural credit when needed by soldiers in any part of the Dominion and the gift of Dominion land in western Canada. The credit may be used for acquiring and improving land, for the payment of incumbrances, erection of buildings, purchase of stocks, etc.

The sum of \$2,916,000 has been appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of this act.

The administration of the law.—The complete administration of the act is in the hands of three departments or divisions. (1) The soldier settlement board, which with the approval of the governors in council may make all funda-

mental regulation with regard to purchase or occupation of land and the granting of loans. The board has offices in each Province, through which cooperation is established with the provincial settlement boards, the land officers, and the advisory boards. (2) The interior department handles all matters in connection with the entry, patenting, etc., of Dominion lands. (3) The provincial advisory boards, which are made up of community leaders, who serve without pay, and whose recommendations largely govern.

Respective spheres of State and Federal acts.—With the exception of a certain amount of land in the western Provinces, the control of patented lands, civil rights, and local administration is in the Province. The Dominion settlement act has, therefore, no jurisdiction over lands in the Provinces, except in the case of those lands reserved by the Government. The loans are intended primarily to assist the soldier to develop the free Dominion lands and secondarily to assist the Provinces when possible. As yet no general agreement has been made between the Provinces and the Dominion Government as to the settlement of soldiers. The aim, however, is to support provincial plans and policies.

The kind and amount of aid offered.—The land.—By civil right the soldier is entitled to 160 acres of vacant Government land. As a soldier he may take up two adjoining quarter sections, making 320 acres. Special reservations have been made within 15 miles of the railroad in northern Alberta.

The credit.—The maximum amount which the board can loan to a settler is \$2,500. However, the amount which may be loaned the settler is in every case dependent upon the value of the security which he gives. In the case of free land the value is determined by its agricultural productions and the commercial value of any other security given. The ability of the applicant to make a living and to meet his obligations is taken into account. The loans will constitute a first charge upon the land. First-mortgage security is given for all loans upon privately owned land.

Payments of principal and interest reach over 20 years; the first two installments may be deferred, but the deferred payments will continue to bear interest.

The rate of interest is 5 per cent per annum.

The conditions of tenure.—The law gives the soldier a freehold right in the land. Patents, however, will not be issued until the entire loan is paid up. Transfers prior to that time are with the consent of the board. Residence and cultivation of the land are required. The settler may at any time pay to the board the whole or any part of the money borrowed with interest.

Selection and training of the soldiers.—Applications are passed on by the advisory board in each province. It is the duty of these boards to see that the applicant is justly dealt with, according to the merits of the case. This board may send the soldier to a farmer for instruction or to an agricultural training station. He may again place the soldier upon the land and recommend that a grant be made. (It has been reported that the men are as a rule averse to an assignment to farmers for help, but are not opposed to a period of training in an agricultural school, where presumably they may work together.)

The act empowers the Soldiers Settlement Board to employ farm instructors and inspectors to assist settlers and instruction for training in domestic and household science for settlers' wives and female dependents.

The progress of settlement.—One week after the opening date for filing applications (July, 1918) a total of 28,000 acres to 181 soldiers was granted.

Six hundred and ninety thousand and eight hundred dollars in loans to 606 applicants were approved by July 15. It is reported that 10,000 additional acres of Dominion land will be cultivated by soldiers this year.

New Brunswick.

Legislation.—The act of April, 1916, "to provide for settlements after the war," gives new duties to the Farm Settlement Board and creates an honorary body known as the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board receives from the Farm Settlement Board proposals for the selection of suitable lands, both private and crown; also proposals for the furnishing of supplies, equipment, instruction, and education to settlers. These proposals are reported with recommendations to the Governor in Council, who in turn may make regulations for the proposals agreed upon. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may borrow such funds as may be necessary upon the credit of the Province.

The kind and amount of aid.—Land will be sold or granted to settlers in amounts varying from 10 to 100 acres. Opportunity will be given to enlarge acreage.

In purchased lands the soldier pays 10 per cent cash, the balance in 20 years, paid semiannually with interest.

A patent or deed to the land will be given upon the payment of all advances.

Selection and training of soldiers.—New Brunswick's plan is to develop settlements at once and to send men to them for employment and experience. A suitable village or town site is selected and small farms laid out in the immediate neighborhood, with larger farms in outlying portions. A Government demonstration farm is a part of the plan; here teams and implements are available as in the case of Ontario.

Settlement progress.—An area of 20,000 acres has already been set aside for beginning settlements. These settlements are to accommodate 100 to 250 families.

Province of Ontario.

Legislation and appropriations.—Of all the Provinces of Canada Ontario undoubtedly leads in the scheme which it has adopted for the settlement of the soldier, as well as the progress that it has made in actual settlement. The first soldiers' act (No. 150) was passed in 1916. Its purpose was to make available the immense territory known as the Clay Belt, which extends west from the boundary between Ontario and Quebec for a distance of 400 miles. The soil is a rich clay loam, free from rock and well adapted to mixed farming. The district is reached by two railroads.

A \$5,000,000 appropriation has recently been made for northern development, the larger part of which will be used in the interest of the soldiers.

The administration of the act.—This is primarily in the hands of the deputy minister of lands and forests. A committee represented by members from the Department of Lands, Forests and Mines, the Department of Agriculture, the Military Hospital Commission, the Great War Veteran's Association, the Soldiers' Aid Commission, the Canadian Patriotic Funds Commission, and the Vocational Training School pass upon applications and determine the disposition to be made of the soldier.

The plan is wholly a provincial one, so that its relation thus far to the Dominion board is only indirect and incidental.

Kind and amount of aid granted.—One hundred acres, of which 10 have been cleared, will be allowed each soldier without charge. When necessary a loan not to exceed \$500 will be made to pay for housing, machinery, tools, and live stock. The amount loaned is repayable in 20 years with 6 per cent interest. No payment of principal or interest is required for three years. This may appear a small amount, but is not so when other aid is taken into account. The ex-soldier is paid for clearing his 10 acres and also receives the assistance of his fellow settlers. A central colony farm will be established in each district. Here the settler may obtain the use of houses and a stock of the heavier farm implements without the need of purchase. The central farm will assist in many other ways.

While the men are in training or employed in groups they will be paid. Single men receive \$2.50 per day, married men \$1.10 a day with a maximum monthly allowance of \$30 for dependents.

The land tenure.—A patent from the Crown is obtainable in five years from the time the soldier begins work on his own land. He must have carried forward the development of his land.

The selection and training of soldiers.—Applicants for land are first given a physical examination. Their applications are then considered by a committee, the members of which have already been indicated. Most of the men are sent to the Agricultural Training Depot, established on the Government experimental farm at Montith. After longer or shorter training periods they are then sent to the farm colonies that have already been established. Already several hundred men have been provided with land. As early as October, 1917, there were 500 applications for land on file.

British Columbia.

Legislation and appropriations.—A number of acts have been passed in this Province to aid the soldiers. The acts confer added powers upon the Land Settlement Board, which, with the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, can make loans, lease, exchange, set aside Crown lands, purchase, subdivide, and farm private lands. The land settlement act of 1918 permits the board to establish "Settlement areas" where good but undeveloped lands

are available. Owners therein must either improve their lands or sell to the board at an appraised value. If the owner files a statement claiming a higher value, such value will be taken for assessment. The penalty for not making improvements is a tax of 5 per cent of the board's or the owner's values, in addition to all other taxes.

The soldier's land act of 1918 empowers the board to expend not more than \$500,000 for the purchase of private land.

The administration.—The Minister of Lands administers all affairs concerning lands; the Land Settlement Board in cooperation with other related departments of the Government deals with the soldiers. The Agricultural Credit Commission administers the loan funds. In general, British Columbia in common with most of the other Provinces has not found it necessary to provide for service men, but merely to enlarge the powers of the existing agencies.

State and Federal action.—The act of 1918 instructs the Lieutenant Governor in Council to convey to the Dominion such Crown lands as may be necessary. In this way the Dominion appropriation of \$2,500 may be used for British Columbia soldiers. Fifty thousand acres have already been set aside for soldier settlement.

The British Columbia Government does not state expressly what assistance it will give soldiers, each case being dealt with individually. The aid is liberal, however. A soldier may acquire 160 acres of free land or purchase through the board this amount of private land.

British Columbia follows the general plan of Ontario as to the training of soldiers, relying somewhat more, perhaps, on turning the soldiers over to farmers to gain the necessary experience.

Australia.

Australia's experience in land settlement.—The Australian States have had a relatively long experience in the purchase, subdivision, and settlement of lands; they can in general do little more for the soldier than they have done for the settler since 1901, except to hasten the development of new areas of land and to increase the rate of purchase. Between 1901 and 1914 the six Australian States purchased and subdivided 3,056,957 acres, for which \$55,243,125 was paid, or about \$18 an acre. Settlers were also assisted to build homes and to make needed improvements. Between 1909 and 1914, \$68,029,500 was loaned for improvements. The Commonwealth Government alone will advance £100,000 to settlers in 1917-18. It expects to advance £2,000,000 in 1918-19. The farmer pays a higher rate of interest than that paid by the State; land settlement has, therefore, not been an added burden to the taxpayer. Although Australia has vast areas of land unoccupied, most of that which is susceptible of being brought under cultivation at moderate expense has already undergone development. A serious problem confronts the Dominion and State governments in providing land in any such proportion as that which has already been called for by her soldiers.

The Dominion Government.—The Australian Dominion Government was the first to draft a fully adequate law to repatriate the soldier, be he maimed or whole bodied. The repatriation act of 1916 was intended to consolidate and stabilize the private patriotic funds which were being accumulated in the several States, and were being administered locally. The Government added to the sums collected by the States, making a total fund of £359,355. This was used for relief and vocational service of all kinds, including small sums for the reestablishment of shops and small farms.

The next step was a beginning toward actual settlement. In consideration of the number of men in the Army who have expressed a desire to take up land the Government contemplates an expenditure of £20,000,000—an equivalent for the population of the United States of about \$2,000,000,000, to place soldiers upon the land.

Respective spheres of State and Federal action.—Under the plan worked out with the States the latter are to provide the land for settlement, while the Commonwealth makes advances to cover the cost of the improvements, stock, etc. The plan of cooperation as at present worked out is to the effect that the Commonwealth will supply the necessary funds, amounting to £22,000 in all, for the credit and advances of all kinds to settlers. A joint board, consisting of a minister for each State and the Commonwealth minister, will supervise operations. "The board will recommend advances of money to soldier settlers, decide upon the purposes for which such advances may be made, decide upon the

rate of interest and method of repayment. * * * The advances will be made at reasonable rates. Each settler will be allowed an advance up to the full value of his improvements. In this way capital which each settler must possess of his own will be reduced to a comparatively small figure."

New South Wales.

Legislation and appropriation.—The soldiers' settlement act was passed in 1916 and amended in 1917, which gave the minister power to set apart any area, crown land or land acquired in closer settlement acts, for the benefit of soldiers. In general, land is acquired by the soldiers under the customary forms of land tenure, such as that of the Farmstead Home or the Crown Lease. Provisions are made in the Returned Soldiers' Special Holding and in that of Group Settlement Purchase. This special legislation gives the settlers a few advantages, such as that of group settlement and application by one or more (instead of three) settlers for the purchase of private land which the purchaser has selected.

The administration.—The Minister of Lands has full charge of all settlements and loans. A large number of district land officers assist. Applications are dealt with by a Classification Committee.

New South Wales has developed a complete system for settlement and advance of credit; mention is not made of the existence of a working arrangement with the Dominion Government.

Kind and amount of aid—The land.—The most important aid which New South Wales gives her soldiers is found in the method by which land values are fixed and the long time allowed for payment, and low interest rate. The value fixed is as near the earning capacity of the land and its location as it is possible to make it. The annual payments are fixed at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of this capital value. The semiannual payments are spread over 38 years, the first two years being omitted. In the case of the group-settlement purchase five years' residence on the block or employment in the group settlement is required. Payments begin six months after purchase and are at the rate of 6 per cent of the value. In the purchase of private land with the approval of the minister the purchaser is obliged to pay the first installment, the balance being provided by the Government, and repayable by annual installments. Ten years' residence is required, and improvement equal to 10 per cent of capital value must be effected in 2 years, 15 per cent in 5 years, and 25 per cent in 10 years.

The credit.—Five hundred pounds are advanced for improvements. Such advances will be allowed for improvements effected by the settler in the same way as if work had been done by contract or hired labor. Maintenance is allowed during probationary work, but such allowances must come out of the loan. Repayment of loans will be extended over 25 years (first five years' interest only to be paid). Tools, stock, and implements are paid for in six years (first year interest only to be paid). Seeds, plants, trees, one year.

The land tenure.—New South Wales does not give an absolute title to the land. When all conditions have been met the holder receives a lease in perpetuity, which for all practical purposes is equivalent to a freehold title. The "rent" for the land, as has been said, is based upon the capital value of the land as determined by the Local Land Board, reappraisal of this value being made in 20-year periods.

Selection and training of the soldiers.—Every man in the imperial service who wants a farm is given an opportunity to show his fitness. He may on his own initiative gain six months' experience on a farm or go to the Government Farm for the necessary training.

Settlement progress.—The State has made fair progress in providing farms. Preparation of 1,000 farms in the Yanco irrigation area is already under way. The average farm is to be 50 acres. Other areas are under development.

The State plans to lay great emphasis upon the cooperative services which may be used in the community. These services apply not only to the preparation of the lands of settlers, but to such matters as distribution and sale of products, purchase of supplies, establishment and management of canneries, creameries, etc. Settlers on the projects of the State have always shown great willingness to loan their labor and their teams for the use of newcomers.

The State has already been called upon to provide farms for 5,000 ex-soldiers and is finding difficulty in keeping pace with the demand, although up to March the Government had purchased 18 estates of 171,213 acres, and it is proposed to make 2,000,000 acres available by January, 1920.

Victoria.

Legislation and appropriations.—Under the Victoria closer settlement act some 567,687 acres have been purchased for civilian settlement. The lands average \$37 an acre in cost and were sold to the settlers for about \$45 an acre, supervision and settlement, absorbing the difference. Up to the beginning of the year 4,112 settlers had secured land under the act.

Victoria's act for the settlement of discharged soldiers on the land was passed October, 1917 (8 Geo. V 2916). The act makes special provision for returned soldiers beyond those found in the general closer settlement act of 1915. It also authorizes extensive development of irrigated areas and purchase of nonirrigable land. Moneys expended in agricultural development come from the sale of State bonds in the London market.

Administration of the law.—The land purchase and management board, responsible to a minister of lands, administers the law in regard to all non-irrigable land, and the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission is responsible for settlement upon irrigable areas.

The council of every district or municipality is made an advisory committee to the board. The duty of these committees is to report upon land available, to aid and encourage soldiers and to assist the board in every way.

Victoria has opened her lands to all soldiers of the empire who have been duly certified in London as fitted for settlement. The State has been hastening the improvement of all available irrigated land and has made large purchases of land in regions of satisfactory rainfall. Data are not at hand as to the acreage purchased, but some \$5,000,000 has been set aside for this purpose.

It is believed that an expenditure of \$25,000,000 will be necessary to provide sufficient land for the soldiers who return or come to Victoria.

Respective spheres, etc.—Victoria was a party to the original agreement with the Dominion Government with regard to the consolidation of the repatriation fund. She will probably, if she has not already done so, adopt the Dominion plan of settlement as outlined.

Kind and amount of aid.—Civilian settlers are required to pay a deposit of 3 per cent on the capital value of the land on taking it, and to make amortized payments of 6 per cent per annum for 31½ years. Soldiers, however, need make no payments for 3 years.

It is preferred that the soldier have some capital. To this and to the value contributed by the soldier's labor, the State will make additions. The general rule for advances is 70 per cent of existing value up to \$2,500. All loans are made by the State Savings Bank.

The State will also make advances to those soldiers who desire to go in for share farming, when such loans are indorsed by the proper authorities.

Tenure of the land.—Victoria bestows a freehold right in the land. The applicant for land under the general act gets a right to occupy. He then receives a conditional purchase lease which may run for the period of the payments. At the expiration of 12 years, if all covenants and agreements have been met, and all purchase money for land and improvements paid, a Crown Grant for the land is given.

Residence for eight months is required of the civilian; the soldier is exempt from this requirement, but he may not have two holdings and can not sublease.

Selection and training of soldiers.—Experience is gained at the Agricultural College or in working for farmers on the Land Board. The local advisory bodies and the land officers have the responsibility of selecting men.

Victoria is having difficulty in providing land fast enough for soldier needs. The Land Board has asked holders of large tracts to get together and set apart and subdivide acreage for soldiers' needs.

Queensland.

Legislation and appropriations.—The Discharged Soldiers act of 1917 (No. 32 of 1917) provides facilities for the land settlements of discharged soldiers. Practically all of the Crown land in the State has been reserved for the soldiers. Sixty thousand acres of this land have been especially set aside for group settlements. The constitution of the Consolidated Revenue Fund by means of sales of bonds is arranged through the Governor in Council. All expenditures are made by the Minister of Lands, with the approval of the Governor in Council. The act does not state the amount of the fund, but bonds are authorized to meet the requirements.

The kind and amount of aid.—In Queensland, as in New South Wales, public land is disposed of under lease. The terms to the soldier are most generous. No rent is required for the first three years, and from the fourth to the fifteenth year the annual rent is $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the capital value, and is fixed by the Minister of Land. However, the lessee is obliged to meet requirements as to improvements and residence. For the first 10 years of the term the soldier settler may not mortgage his land except to the Commissioner of the Government Savings Bank, or transfer it, except to another returned soldier.

For Crown land the capital value will be from 10 shillings per acre upward, and will not go beyond 30 shillings per acre. On resumed areas the capital value will depend on the price paid by the State.

Credit advances.—The soldier settler may borrow up to \$2,500 from the Government Savings Bank for making improvements on the land, erecting dwellings, etc. While the civilian settler pays 5 per cent for such loans, the soldier settler pays but $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for the first year, 4 per cent during the second year, and an increasing rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per year until the rate of 5 per cent is reached. The repayment of the loan reaches over 40 years. Advances for the purchase of stock, machinery, or implements may command an additional loan. In fact the total advances may amount to as much as \$6,000.

Land tenure.—Both in the case of public land and that resumed a freehold title is not given, but in its place the occupant receives a perpetual lease selection when all the conditions have been met.

Progress of soldier settlement.—Three large areas are at present undergoing development for soldier settlement. The Beerburren Settlement is in the most advanced condition. The total area of this settlement is some 51,000 acres and the land is suitable for pineapple growing, also that of citrus fruits. At this settlement there is a training farm where the men are given working knowledge of the agricultural conditions of the region. They receive wages of from two pounds to two pounds ten shillings a week while there. There is also a general store and a State school, together with a library. At Pikedale, a border town near New South Wales, there is also another area of 17,400 acres. Clearing and road making is going on in this reservation. A State nursery has been planned and soldiers will be employed on it. Another center is at Oswald's Track in North Queensland near Innisfail. Here 157,300 acres have been reserved for soldiers. The land is suitable for dairying, general agriculture, and sugar-cane farms. Another 40,000 acres are projected in the Cecil Plains in the Toowoomba district, and still another 112,000 acres on Mount Hutton. Further areas amounting to 52,400 acres in various parts of the State have been set aside.

South Australia.

The administration.—In this State an act was passed in 1915, and another in 1916 (7 Geo. V, No. 1264). In this act the powers of the land board, the land commissioner, and the governor are specified. The governor has the power to set aside lands, to purchase lands, and to make any regulations conducive to the purpose of the act. A separate machinery is not set up for the execution of the law.

South Australia has joined the Federal plan as outlined under Dominion Government.

The aid rendered soldiers.—The usual low rate of interest and long-term payments are accorded the soldier. Assistance for development is available both from the State and the Federal Government. The rent of the land in the case of the soldier may be remitted for as long a time as the commissioner deems necessary. The settler is expected to have some capital.

Tenure of the land.—South Australia gives a perpetual lease rather than a freehold title. No lease granted can be transferred except on the recommendation of the land board with the consent of the commissioner.

Training of soldiers.—The Government has established farms in the repurchased land and the irrigation areas for the training of ex-service men who have not had previous experience.

Progress of settlement.—Two large blocks of land have been purchased for closer settlement. There are large areas of Crown lands suitable for wheat growing. Much other land is available when it can be drained.

Western Australia.

Government provisions.—The State has reserved land in the "Wheat belt" and in the "Southwest." In the wheat belt the soldier may purchase 840 acres at 15 shillings per acre and select 160 acres for which he need only pay the survey fee. For this and for any money the Government may have expended for the land, payment is spread over 30 years. To handle such a farm the soldier should have a capital of £500, but some of this can be borrowed from the Agricultural Bank. Residence and progressive improvements are required.

In the Southwest timbered land the soldier may select 160 acres. A part of this will be cleared by the Government.

Training stations are provided in the Southwest. The State does not pay men while gaining experience, as work is available on every hand.

Tasmania.

Tasmania has, in general, followed the plan of New Zealand in dividing its lands for soldier settlement into ordinary and special tenures. By the act of 1916 (7 George V, No. 20) the Closer Settlement Board, established by prior acts, was given the task of soldier settlement, the same act providing a closer settlement fund of not less than £150,000. The Tasmanian Administration is notably liberal with soldiers. Interest is waived for the first 12 months and payments of principal for the first four years, all of the deferred interest being added on to the principal to be paid back over a long term of years. In common with other Australian States this Government gives the soldier a credit of £500.

The land can be acquired either by purchase or on lease. First-class land may be bought by the 200 acres at £1 per acre; second-class land of a larger number of acres can be obtained at 10 shillings per acre, and third-class land of still larger areas at 5 shillings per acre.

Residence is necessary according to the provisions of the Crown Lands acts. No interest or taxes will be payable for four years for the sale, or in the case of lease of the land no rent will be charged for the first year.

NEW ZEALAND.

Legislation and appropriations.—The first act was passed in 1915, but it was extensively amended in 1916 and 1917. Lands for soldiers are of two classes, ordinary tenures being areas for general farming and sheep runs, and special tenure being small acreage near towns and cities, largely for disabled soldiers. Lands under ordinary tenures are purchased or set apart by proclamation. These may be obtained for cash, occupation with right of purchase, renewal lease, or small grazing run lease, as the case may be.

In the year 1917, 276,290 acres were set apart for the soldiers.

The demand for land in New Zealand is very great, the best portions which are suitably served by transportation being already settled. Under the Public Works act (1908) the Government has the right to prescribe the limit of area which may be retained by a landowner for different classes of land. This law is invoked for the benefit of the soldier, in the case of land in the neighborhood of the cities. In 1916 £500,000 was appropriated for this purpose. The Land Board may also purchase any private property when it is specifically applied for by a discharged soldier. In this case land must be offered voluntarily to the State.

In addition to the above amount £120,000 has been appropriated for advances to soldiers and for roadways opening blocks of land.

The administration.—Land purchases and settlements are placed in the hands of the Land Board with the consent of the minister. The Land Board is assisted by a staff of inspectors and instructors. Complaint is made, however, that the absence of a special soldiers' board has been detrimental to the interests of the soldier; that his case and his rights which have been recognized so fully elsewhere are not sufficiently protected.

Kind and amount of aid.—In the purchase of land the soldier pays 5 per cent down and 5 per cent interest. A lease will have a 66-year term, with perpetual right of renewal at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent based on the capital value of the land.

Advances of £500 and even £750 will be made for purchases of private land, for transfer of lease, or any land administered by the board. Such advances are also used for all ordinary purposes of improvement. All sums are advanced as required rather than in lump.

Land tenure.—This is either in the form of lease or freehold. New Zealand has not adopted a uniform policy in either direction in the case of settled lands. Lands held under lease may be purchased by the soldier. The range land is, however, always held under lease. The soldier is not permitted to transfer his land without the consent of the board for a period of 10 years. The land is re-valued at intervals, both for taxation and lease payments.

Selection, training, and placing of soldiers.—The board does not emphasize preparatory training. A man is early placed upon the land, and his instruction left to agricultural agents.

Up to March 31, 1917, 319 applicants were provided with 143,524 acres. One hundred and eighty were placed upon Crown lands and 131 upon land acquired under the land settlement act.

The Government has provided suburban land suitable for market gardening, poultry farms, small areas of rural land adapted to beekeeping, small farms suitable for dairying, fruit growing, etc.; large holdings suitable for mixed farming; and pastoral country for grazing only.

Thirty thousand nine hundred and fifty-six pounds have been paid to 143 soldiers. The rate of progress is, however, not entirely satisfactory. Of the 16,670 soldiers that have returned from the front up to May 1, 1918, only 624 have taken up land. It is claimed settlement is not pushed by the land board.

UNION OF SOUTH AMERICA.

No legislation of importance has been passed in the Union of South Africa making toward the settlement of soldiers. The British South African Co. has 500,000 acres for settlement. There has also been formed the Royal Colony Institute with 2,000 acres of irrigable land. This land is to be divided into blocks of 30 and 40 acres, the latter to be the maximum to be allowed, although a settler may acquire further land outside of this area. The State will provide station officers and will, if necessary, arrange for the erection of such permanent improvements as are necessary, the cost of this undertaking to be added to the purchase price.

The British South African Co.'s land is irrigable and they will clear the land of bush, stumps, and plow to a depth of 9 or 10 inches. Twenty per cent of the purchase price will be paid in six years and the balance in the four following years. A settler there will not pay interest in the first five years in which he is establishing himself. A working capital of \$2,500 is considered necessary.

I also inclose, for Mr. Sinnott's information, a more recent statement of what has been done in Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada and Ontario on soldier settlement matters than is contained in the pamphlet by Dr. Mead, Summary of Soldier Settlements in English-Speaking Countries, which comprised Exhibit D to the report of May 22.

Cordially, yours,

JOHN W. HALLOWELL,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Enc. 15816.

GREAT BRITAIN.

[From special correspondence to the New York Sun, May 1, 1919.]

The Government has four plans. The first is the forming of a training colony. Here the men take a course in practical agriculture, which is considered necessary, as many soldiers going on the land have had little experience, principally in working an allotment or a kitchen garden only. During tuition the men are paid \$7.50 a week, with a further allowance if married for their wives and children.

After completing the course of training, men with capital are to be provided with plots under the small-holdings act. The Government will grant on loan for the purchase of land or stock a sum equal to the capital of the applicant.

Under what is known as a tenant holding there is provided a cottage with sufficient land to keep a cow and a little small stock and to provide a kitchen garden for growing the family vegetables. This is for men who are skilled workers and is instituted with the idea that the man works the ground for his own needs and spends the greater part of his time working at his own trade.

For the man without capital the plan favored is that of an industrial colony. A large farm will be worked by these men under the direction of a skilled manager. The staff will be employed at a wage slightly higher than the minimum prevailing in the district and will receive a percentage of profit after expenses have been paid.

The board of agriculture has acquired about 6,000 acres in four districts. At Patrington in Yorkshire, Holbeach in Lincolnshire, Heath Hill in Shropshire, and Pembrey on the coast of Carmarthenshire colonies have been arranged.

Patrington, an estate of 2,363 acres, will be run as a single great industrial farm, the profits of which will be shared by those who do the work. Holbeach is to be a group of distinct small holdings of 10 acres each organized on a cooperative basis.

The Patrington Crown Colony, which is about 3 miles from the village of that name, is not far from the Humber and is known locally as "Warpe Land"; that is, land reclaimed from the sea. The deep alluvial soil is better suited for heavy crops of wheat and beans than for fruit growing and market gardening, which are the staple products of the small holdings of 10 acres. This is the reason for the profit-sharing system and the policy of working the Crown Colony as a single big farm.

The colony is easily distinguished by the identical pairs of red-roofed and red-walled cottages built for the settlers. Each house has a half acre of land for the resident's own use. The central homestead is typical English farm of ancient type, suggestive of peace and prosperity.

A man and his family can earn a fair and healthy livelihood on the Patrington colony. The current rate of wages is \$8.40, while the settler's rent amounts to only 72 cents a week. For this he gets a five-roomed house and a half acre of garden.

Holbeach is an object lesson in colonization on a technical plan. It consists of about 1,000 acres, 200 of which are reserved as a central demonstration farm, round which the eighty 10-acre holdings are grouped. From this central farm the colonists will get implements, seeds, fertilizers, and everything they require on cooperative terms, and also free expert advice from the director. The center also will undertake the distribution of produce on the most advantageous terms. Vegetables and fruit will be the staples of production, and will be marketed in the midland towns and in London.

CANADA.

[From S. Maber, Secretary, Soldier Settlement Board, April 29, 1919.]

The Soldier Settlement Board commenced its duties on February 8, 1918, establishing the head office at Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion and the seat of government. The administrative work of the board is vested in three commissioners appointed by the government, one of whom sits as chairman, and a second as secretary. As a department of the government all appointments to the staff of the board are made under the authority of the civil service commission.

Under the immediate supervision of the secretary there are seven branches—"Agricultural Training," "Accounts," "Legal," "General Correspondence," "Lands," "Loans," and "Livestock and Equipment." The heads of these departments supervise through the provincial superintendent's offices the field work carried on by its respective representatives on the provincial staff. All applications received from prospective soldier "settlers" are dealt with by the provincial superintendent for the Province in which applicant desires to settle in, which office is empowered with the necessary authority to extend loans, negotiate purchases of privately owned and partly improved farms and through his staff generally supervises the procedure prospective "settlers" are required to follow to get settled on the land and continue such assistance and supervision after settlement to insure the "settler" every opportunity to successfully manage his farm, pay off his indebtedness to the board, and provide a comfortable living for his dependents.

The attached diagram explains the organization of the board and channels of responsibility.

Since the board's inception the following figures represent the extent of loans made monthly, commencing April, 1918:

Loans during April, 1918	\$18,645.82
Loans during May, 1918	78,750.14
Loans during June, 1918	76,166.95
Loans during July, 1918	93,967.82
Loans during August, 1918	107,902.80
Loans during September, 1918	84,201.39
Loans during October, 1918	95,767.39
Loans during November, 1918	96,260.04
Loans during December, 1918	102,155.00
Loans during January, 1919	82,037.59
Loans during February, 1919	89,034.83
Loans during March, 1919	157,138.15

Our records show over 2,500 men have taken advantage of the free soldier entry and homestead grant since the soldier-settlement act came into operation. With the signing of the armistice and the subsequent rapid demobilization of the troops, the work of the provincial staffs and the head office of the board has increased to such proportion that a very much increased personnel has been required to meet the pressure of the work.

Since the original act was passed the progress of the work has brought to the front many and varied problems interdependent to the success of the scheme for the consideration of the board, the solving of which has necessitated amendments vitally affecting the original act and directed to the attainment of a broad, far-reaching, practical policy of land settlement, having for its object increased production and as a substantial measure of reconstruction to offset the aftermath of war conditions.

Board:

Secretary's office—

Accounts.

Agricultural training.

Lands.

Legal.

Loans.

Live stock and equipment.

General correspondence.

Ottawa—Provincial office:

Salvage or reclamation.

Following up instruction—Inspection—Assistance.

Live stock and equipment.

Qualification branch—

Agricultural training.

Agricultural qualification committee—

Schools.

Experienced farmers.

Appraisal branch—

Valuations and appraisals.

Loan advisory board.

ONTARIO.

[From Felix S. S. Johnson, American consul, Kingston, Canada, May 5, 1919.]

There have been received by the Ontario government 97 applications for farm loans by discharged soldiers. The majority of the farms selected and approved of as security for the \$5,000 Government loan which will apply on the purchase price are of about 100 acres in extent and intended for mixed farming, though there is one instance of a 400-acre place, this being cheap, rough land in the north part of Hastings County (Kingston consular district), which has been chosen for semiranching purposes.

Recently an addition has been made to the working force of the soldiers' settlement board in the form of a department to supervise the deals made by extend-

ing soldier settlers, in connection with the \$2,000 loan to provide for the purpose of live stock and farm equipment.

In the event of a soldier settler making a purchase of live stock or farm equipment under the loan agreement the settlement board are obliged to have an idea of the value of the animals or material purchased, in view of the necessity of assuring security for the loan. Provided the applicant displays sound judgment in making his first few purchases, he is given considerable leeway, and to date the majority of the deals made or suggested by applicants for the loan have been entirely satisfactory.

In most cases the first purchase, after that of the farm, made by most of the soldier settlers is a team of horses, and the selections in this line give evidence of the ability of the settlers as horsemen. However, the interest in live stock does not stop at horses, and most of the men show an inclination to invest in either cattle, sheep, or swine or all three to a considerable extent.

In the matter of equipment most of the soldier settlers are providing themselves with quite a fair share of good secondhand harness, implements, and tools, and are being assisted in making purchases of new material by advice from the live stock and equipment division of the board, and in addition the board has secured an arrangement with the manufacturers by which the soldiers settling on farms may secure new harness of a standard pattern at a very reasonable price whenever they see fit to make application for same.

WORK AND HOMES FOR RETURNING SOLDIERS.

Statement of Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, before Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, January 10, 1919.

Secretary LANE. Mr. Chairman, this scheme for providing work and homes on reclaimed land for our returned soldiers, which has been talked about a good deal in the press and which I made one of the principal features of my annual report this year, has, as you know, received the indorsement of the President in his message to the Congress of December 2. I was very proud to see in the papers yesterday morning that the last article written by Col. Roosevelt was an editorial for one of the magazines, in which he indorses this plan that I had presented originally in May, 1918, to the President and to the Congress.

So you can see it has nothing of partisanship in it. It is a plan for the development of our country in a very large and in a very real way. It is a practical plan. We know that it is practical, because what we propose shall be done, has been done, and is being done.

It is a plan that involves the reclamation of lands of various kinds. I recognize most of you as gentlemen from the West, and you know that for 16 years now you have been passing upon the various reclamation projects that have been brought before you. That work we have carried on with more or less success in a pioneer field. This is an extension and an elaboration of the idea upon which the reclamation act was founded.

The reclamation law, as you know, provided that we should take the arid lands of the West and put water upon them. It was at first thought that it was only necessary to divert the water from the stream.

Later we found it was necessary to build great dams up in the mountains and to bring those waters down through diverging canals and through tunnels and through ditches into lands 50, 60, or 70 miles away from the place where the water was stored. You gentlemen have been liberal in your appropriations for that work. We have spent approximately \$115,000,000 in the last 15 years on it. The works built under the reclamation law are now serving probably 2,000,000 acres under irrigation, comprising land that was worth only a nominal sum before it was irrigated.

It has always been a mystery to me why Congress, in its wisdom, did not see fit to extend the same principle to the lands of the South and the lands of the North. We have a vast body of undeveloped land in the United States. This is an incomplete country. It will be hundreds of years before it is entirely developed, but we know now that there are millions of acres of land in the United States that can be saved ultimately from worthlessness and brought into value and made a permanent part of the United States by drainage, by clearing off stumps and brush, and by reclamation through irrigation.

A clear distinction should, of course, be made between the ultimate possibilities of such reclamation, spread over many decades, and the practical pos-

sibilities of the next few years. We know that there are many millions of acres of unused and unproductive land in this country. It is self-evident, however, that much of this land is not feasible for reclamation purposes under present conditions. In many cases the present cost of reclamation would be prohibitive; in others the soil conditions appear unfavorable; in others a combination of factors make such reclamation practically impossible at the present time and under present economic conditions.

An appropriation of \$100,000,000 would provide for the construction of projects containing approximately 20,000 farms, or, as a rough estimate, a total of only about 1,500,000 acres of cultivated land. There are at present in the United States nearly 7,000,000 farms, so that the addition of these 20,000 farms would mean an increase of less than one-third of 1 per cent. The improved land in farms amounts to something like 550,000,000 acres, so that the addition of 1,500,000 acres to this area already under cultivation could amount to less than three-tenths of 1 per cent. If continued for 10 years, the increase would be only 3 per cent, while the population is increasing five or six times as fast. It can readily be seen that there is little cause for alarm that over-production and depression of prices of farm products would result from the construction proposed at the present time.

I have been through the South lately. It is a marvelous country; it was a new country to me. I had no understanding of that land. They have in North and South Carolina a 55-inch rainfall during the year, which is distributed in such a way that it is possible to get three crops; but they are not self-supporting, because they devote themselves very largely to one money crop—cotton—and possibly tobacco.

There is an Alabama woman named Mrs. Mathis, who is one of the real citizens of this country. She is a farmer, and she discovered some years ago the trouble with Alabama, with quantities of splendid rich land. The whole country is a cotton plantation, and they were bringing down their beef and their mutton and their ham and their bacon and their wheat from Kansas City. So this woman said:

"Why not divide our land up and have three subdivisions in each farm, one devoted to supporting the farmer and his family, providing truck and fruit and taking care of the cow; another part given over to the money crop, to tobacco or peanuts or cotton; and the third devoted to sustaining cattle?"

The only official position this woman has held, so far as I know, is to be the nominal representative of the Alabama Bankers' Association. The result of her position has been that she has really changed Alabama into a State that is self-sufficient; and the same thing can be done in every one of these Southern States. I made a trip from here to the southern end of Florida. On the 15th day of December I picked an ear of green corn, what the South calls a "roastin'" ear, and the seed had been planted on the 15th day of October. There is no reason why we should not have in Washington, in midwinter, green corn from Florida.

I believe I could safely undertake to say that the territory from here to the southern end of Florida could sustain the entire population of the United States, because not half, not one-third, of that land that is cultivable is cultivated. Much of it that is cultivated is cultivated poorly.

Along the coast—and you gentlemen who know anything about this country know this to be true—along the coastal plain there have been great pine forests that have been cut down. This is true in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and eastern Texas; there are also great bodies of these lands in Arkansas and in Tennessee. That land very largely needs to be reclaimed by a very simple process of drainage.

I saw a few acres of swamp land in North Carolina; it is marked upon the Government map as swamp, a great green swamp. They are cutting down the timber on it. In the very heart of this swamp I saw what they call stuck corn. A plow never had been through this land; there had never been a hoe upon it. The land was entirely fresh. Boys had passed along the land, in a row, and with a stick made a hole 6 inches deep in the ground and dropped in a couple of seeds of corn; and they had bins full of this corn, which had been grown in that way. That is the kind of land we want to reclaim. And we can reclaim it by a simple system of drainage canals and ditches.

Gentlemen, there are 40,000,000 acres of tillable land between here and eastern Texas, as good land as is under the sun, totally unused.

We have the land; we have it in every part of this country, in the North as well as in the South. One of the richest parts of the United States is Aroostook County, Me. Maine has been deserted in part in her farming regions because

the boys have had a lust for the western country that I love, and I can not blame them for that; but they have left good farms there. In Massachusetts it may surprise you to know, perhaps, that we have one little section of country around Cape Cod where there is some of the richest land in the United States, and it has been proved so in the last two or three years; and in the body of the State they have very considerable quantities of land that needs to be cared for a little bit, cut-over land that has been deserted, that needs to be brought into shape, that will make good farm land. The same thing is true in New York.

I was looking over yesterday a plat of New York which showed three drainage possibilities in that State, and we can get a project there of 60,000 acres of extremely rich land that needs only to be drained.

There are in the United States millions of acres of unused and unproductive land, much of which it is entirely feasible, under present conditions, to irrigate, drain, or otherwise reclaim and bring into use. As I have just said, I do not, of course, propose that we shall undertake the huge job of making all that land serviceable in the next few years to the people of this country and to the world. But I do propose that we shall make a beginning at it, and what better opportunity can there be than this, when the boys are coming back?

There is a doubt, perhaps, in your minds as to whether these boys want to go upon the lands. I am not satisfied with the situation as it is to-day in the United States, and I think you men who have vision, who can look forward two, three, four, five, or six months, must yourselves feel that you have a responsibility in regard to this matter that you can not be indifferent to. There is no man here who would rise and say that he feels sure that the labor market will be satisfactory six months from now or three months from now, or that there will be a job waiting for the soldier who returns, when he gets to New York, or when he reaches his home. What are we going to do for these men? We can not have them floating about the United States looking for something to do. This is no time for that condition in this country or in any other country.

There is only one way of meeting a situation like that, and that is by provision; you have got to see what is going to come before it actually arrives; you have got to have the cunning sense of the aviator who knows he is going to meet an air current before he actually strikes it, and adapts himself to it.

We have an incomplete country; we have an undeveloped country; we need tens of thousands of miles of good roads in the United States. I am not saying to you gentlemen that all the money you should put into providing work for these men against a probable surplus of labor should be put into this scheme; but I believe, and I say it to you very seriously, that you ought to be prepared—and upon you rests the initial responsibility—you ought to be prepared to have some work available to which you can assign a man who comes back from France or from one of the cantonments, and who has not a job awaiting him.

The time is coming—yes, it has come—when we must feel a real responsibility for providing not merely for returned soldiers but for the man in the United States, no matter who he may be, who is willing to work. I want to say to this Congress, to the Congresses that are to come, and to this Nation that no man who is willing to work should be without a job, and I will agree personally to provide the work which will give the man a job and add to the wealth of this Nation if you will adopt that policy. It is the wise policy to adopt if we are to have a chance in the United States to prove that democracy is the kind of government that the world wants. [Applause.]

These boys are coming home, and they are coming home with the idea in their heads that the United States will see that they have something to do; they are coming home with the idea in their heads that what they want to do is not to work in an office but to work in the open. My boy has come home. When he left he was in the university. He went into the Aviation Corps, and has been in France a year. From the university his intention was to go to the law school and become a lawyer. He has abandoned the idea of the university; he says he is too old now to go to a university. He was only 18 when he left. He will not go into law, and I asked him what he was going to do. He wants to go out West somewhere and go on a farm.

I have hundreds of letters here, and I am going to send extracts from some of them to you which boys have sent to me regarding this proposition from France and from the cantonments in the United States.

We are meeting exactly the same thing that we met in the Civil War. I do not see any Civil War veterans here, but you can probably recall—and it must be so, because it appears in the records of the Land Office—that the boys of

the different States wanted to live the life in the open; and it was these boys who largely settled in and made the western prairie country, and the country I come from in the Far West. The great rush to the Pacific coast came along in the seventies. And now our boys are all coming back in the same way, in the same spirit, with the same desire, and the same kind of peculiar self-respect as that of the man who came back from South Africa whom Kipling tells us about in his "Chant Pagan."

It is the story of a man who comes back to be a butler or a gardener in an English house. He has been in the Boer War. He reviews his own personal record in South Africa and then he says, "Me, that has been what I have been; me, that has seen what I have seen; they ask me to carry a letter as far as the post office and be sure to return without getting my feet wet." He has an entirely new vision of his own value, and he has an entirely different desire from that which he formerly had as to the kind of life he should lead.

I had a letter yesterday from a man in France. He said he had been talking the matter over with the boys in his regiment and that probably 80 per cent of them would like to go on to farms. We have a little hospital which is supported by the people in the Interior Department, and we find that about four men out of ten of these convalescent boys want to go upon farms. Even the women are stirred up about it. These girls we induced as war workers to go into the fields are anxious that there should be one of these projects where women could prove themselves as farmers.

The secret of this whole proposition, aside from the land and the willingness of the boys to go upon the land, lies in the type of the settlement, in the fact that we must not abandon the farmer once we have given him land. Serious thought must be devoted to the development of a farm settlement project. In the past it has taken about three crops of men—this is about the wastage, and I think you gentlemen from the West will agree with me on this—it has taken about three crops of men to develop a quarter section of land. The first man has come on as the pioneer and taken up his quarter section. He has lived as long as he could, and he has endured. Of course, he has had the benefit of the game and he has lived a hardy life. He has broken a bit of the land, but after a time his money is gone, another crop of settlers comes, and he sells out. The next man struggles as long as he can, and finally the third man comes and that third man stays with the land.

We want to develop a system by which men can go to and stay upon farm community settlements which will be planned. And this absence of previous planning is the weakness of the present haphazard method, or lack of method, in settlement all over this country. Woman has the key to the whole situation. She has got to be satisfied, and she will not be satisfied as long as she lives in isolation.

Our insane asylums in the West are filled with the wives of farmers who have gone crazy in the dreary isolation of farm life. We want to have upon each one of these projects a community settlement, and have the farms radiate out from that settlement, all brought in just as near as possible to the one center, and from that center roads radiating out to the farms. In that settlement should be a good schoolhouse, not a one-story affair, but a good schoolhouse which would be the very center and heart of the whole community, a schoolhouse that would be tied up to these farms that encircle it, where the boy would learn as much as he learns on some of our Indian reservations now. And, incidentally, this is more than is taught in most of the American public schools, for we try in the best Indian reservations to teach the boy how to plant and raise four crops, how to shoe a horse, how to put up a shack; and we teach the girls how to make one suit of clothes for herself, how to make a hat, how to care for a sick baby, how to care for a sick man, and how to cook all her own meals for a month. We ought to have a central school in every one of the settlements where these children would be tied up to the farm life, and the father would realize that the problems which the boy has in school are problems which deal directly with the production on the farm.

In that settlement there should be a good moving-picture house; there should be a good hall. It should be the center of the social life and the center of the economic life of the whole settlement.

We have got much to learn about marketing. Our farmer is a poor cooperator. He does not know how to get together with a mass of men and work together for a common end. The price of crops does not have to fall because there are more crops produced, if growers know how to market their produce. That is proved conclusively by the experience of our citrus growers in southern California.

When I knew that crop originally it was 12,000 carloads a year, and the farms were falling in value. Those wise men, who came from the East to southern California, who knew nothing about raising citrus fruit, said "This is not business. We are sending our oranges and lemons into places which are already congested with oranges and lemons, and the result is our bills all come back in the red."

After the transportation and the commission merchant's charges were paid off they got no return for the oranges and lemons. What did they do? They employed a man who knew his business as traffic manager at \$15,000 a year. A group of farmers employed that man and they also employed an expert on diseases whom they got from the Department of Agriculture, and they sent him to Spain and to Sicily to find out what diseases they were threatened with and how to cure them.

Then they built a series of warehouses for themselves and put all their crop through a sieve. They graded it and made arrangements with the railroad by which all their oranges could be tested out in the different markets, and if there was a glut in one market the car would go to a market where there was a demand, with the result that to-day there are 65,000 carloads of citrus fruits coming out of that State. And the same thing is being done in Florida to some extent. It can be done in Idaho and every section of this country. You can not make the United States simply improve itself. You have got to put thought into it and the man on the farm has got to put thought into it.

Now, then, we have the boy, we have the land, we have the scheme, and we do not want to leave that fellow alone unprotected there to work out his own salvation. We want to give that boy, in the first instance, an education as to the kind of agriculture he is to carry on, and then we want to leave with him a sensible man who will give him directions so that the scheme will be worked out clearly, so that he simply will not be thrown into the world and forgotten.

It is a perfectly simple thing to do. Every one of the agricultural colleges you support in all the States can provide men who know that particular piece of land and who will stay on there as production managers to give advice to these men as to what is the best crop this year and next year, so far as maintaining the fertility of the soil is concerned, and how the crop shall be cultivated. We have tried this thing; we know it can be done.

Now, gentlemen, I have asked, and I think Mr. Byrnes, of South Carolina, has put in an amendment to the appropriation bill for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for this plan. My only regret about that is that the amount is so small. It is ridiculously, absurdly small. If we contributed in the proportion as Australia has contributed to the same kind of a proposition we would be appropriating to-day \$4,000,000,000. Canada makes an offer of 160 acres of land, and an additional 160 acres as a possibility, and \$2,500 plus \$500, \$3,000 in all, to her returning soldier. Canada has erred in just one respect, I think, in that she has not planned the farm and the farm settlement. She has been wise in giving her men an education, even while they are in the field. They have had behind the lines what they called the Vimy Ridge Agricultural College, in which men still in the Army are being given an education, and were being given an education two years ago, against the day of their return to Canada.

I do not know whether you gentlemen realize what war costs. You know what appropriations you have made; you know that you were spending at the conclusion of this war over \$50,000,000 a day for the conduct of the war. I would like to see you give me at least what war costs for a week. Just throw out the Sunday and give to me what it cost for the other six days to try and take care of these men of our country, to make them more comfortable, more resourceful, and more contented.

We are going to have great problems in this country in the next few years, and the best kind of man whom we can have in the United States is the man who is anchored to our soil and has some satisfaction in his home. There is no way by which you can do this for less money than the way I have pointed out to you. Let us give to these men, on 40-acre farms or 50-acre farms, not merely the bare land, but a home upon the land, the cottage, the barn, the land fenced in, the land plowed, the first crop put in, the necessary farm implements, and have the place ready so he and his wife can move in immediately and go to work upon that place. Let it be a place where the man can live comfortably and make a decent living and be proud of it.

I would take all these boys personally and say to them, "If, after you have gone to your homes, and do not find the old job all ready and open for you, then

here is a job for you. We will pay you the current rate of wages while you are clearing this ground, while you are removing the stumps and undergrowth, while you are draining this swamp, digging that ditch or building that dam in the Far West; we will give you good wages, we will take care of you in a barracks that will look palatial to you.

"Then, after you have worked for a year or two years upon that project, pick out your farm. You have joined in digging the ditch that makes the farm possible; you will have joined in building that which makes the farm habitable." We will set up a demand for agricultural implements and a great many other things that will stimulate the industries back home so that there will not be so many fellows back there that will need to be taken care of. Then this boy can move out on that farm and be prepared to make a living for himself and for his family; and he should not be called upon to pay for the farm immediately. We want him to be allowed 40 years in which to pay for it, but in the end he will pay every cent of it and pay interest on the money. The soldier does not ask any charity, and we are not going to get a strong, virile people by giving charity, by doing things for them, except giving them opportunities; and that is that we propose this Government shall give these men, an opportunity to make farms for themselves, to make a living for themselves, and then to pay back to the Government the money which the Government has advanced, and to pay that money back plus interest. They can do it, easily, paying 4 per cent interest, in 40 years.

We are paying this year, gentlemen, and you may not realize this, \$221,000,000 in pensions for the war that closed 54 years ago and for the Spanish American War. When I came into office six years ago the pensions ran up to \$180,000,000. There were 300,000 Civil War veterans, practically, still alive, but by the deaths, which come along at the rate of about 30,000 a year, that sum was reduced to \$170,000,000. Last year by the addition of different bills you appropriated \$187,000,000. This year you have raised it so that we are paying now, or practically during the next fiscal year we will pay, under our estimates, \$221,000,000 for pensions.

This scheme that I present is far better than any pension scheme that can be presented. It is a scheme by which you make American men, and by which you make American land. It is a scheme by which you add to the territory, the available useful territory of the United States. You do not have to fight for it, you do not have to shed your blood for it. You do not have to put up \$50,000,000 a day in order to get it. You do not have to rob anybody or do injustice to a neighbor in order to get it. You get it simply by the expenditure of your own money in advance and have that money brought back to you. Most of these lands are lands that are in private ownership, and those lands can be had at our own appraisalment and not at what the owners think they are worth.

We have been through every State and we find there is a practical project in almost every State. In every State there is a body of men, who are solicitous for the soldier, who believe the war is not over until we have taken care of the boys on their return; these men own large tracts of land, and are willing to turn that land over to us, the United States to pay nothing for it whatever except that the owners of the land shall have returned to them whatever we appraise that land to be worth, the money to come in within the 40 years, when we get our money. It is a perfectly practical scheme. We looked over the map yesterday, and I suppose in some of the States there are as many as a dozen possible projects upon that basis.

In the State of Florida there are a million and a half acres owned by the State, which they are perfectly willing to turn over to us on this basis, we to drain them. Up in Wisconsin and in Michigan, there is some of this land held by the lumber companies which is worthless to-day, not being used, that we can get at our own figure, the lumber companies to get their money back when we get it ourselves, and not until then.

In the West the great bulk of this land is public land, and there we have the basis for large irrigation projects, as our plans include either a great irrigation scheme or a great drainage scheme in every State west of the Missouri River, in every State in the South, and in practically every other State except Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and we may later be able to develop projects in these States.

We want to distribute these settlements as widely as possible so as to reveal the method by which farm life can be made agreeable as well as successful, and then this current that is running to-day against the country and in favor

of the city will run the other way. In this decade that has passed, from 1900 to 1910, the movement to the city was unprecedented, and the relative increase in the number of farms was the smallest in the history of this country. We have got to stop that in some way. You can not afford, as statesmen, to let the people of the United States become dependent upon foreign countries for food supplies. You know we were importing beef from Argentine before this war.

You can not afford to have the people of the United States centered as they are now in the cities of the United States. When I was a boy we had in this country 75 per cent of our population on the farms, or in farm villages. To-day we have not 50 per cent. More than one-half of our people are living in the cities—and living upon the people in the country—congested, working to develop American industry, but not working to develop those fundamental things upon which we have found in the last year nations depend.

I do not believe there is any doubt but that we will have the men to do this work, and there is no fear of overproduction. We can not possibly produce more than 20,000 or 25,000 new farms out of this amount of \$100,000,000, which is the largest amount we have dared to ask for, knowing how anxious for economy you were. We can not possibly give employment to more than 100,000. There is no danger of taking away from the present farmer any advantage he has. Twenty thousand new farms is about one-third of 1 per cent of the number of farms there are now in the United States. So there is no threat against the present farmer in this proposition.

But we ought to have work for the man when he comes back, and if times become hard three months from now, I want you to think about this proposition—that in Michigan and Wisconsin we can put at work just as many men as will be out of employment in the great Central West, and down in North and South Carolina and Florida and Louisiana we can put more men at work—hundreds of thousands of men, if need be, and care for them. All that will be necessary will be to have the money. We can not do it with \$100,000,000. We can take care of a few, but there are rare possibilities there, and you gentlemen ought to think of it.

It is an opportunity for us, an opportunity to show gratitude towards the men who made the great sacrifice, who have done the thing you and I were willing to do but that we did not have the chance to do, because Uncle Sam would not take us. It is a great deal better that we should extend to that man this opportunity to make his own living, and make an independent living, and to add to the wealth of this country, than that he should be a dependent for years to come, or that he should be cast adrift, and prove once more that republics are ungrateful. This Republic is not ungrateful. It never has been ungrateful. It is the most liberal and generous Government that the world has ever seen.

But we are not asking generosity now. We are asking something that is ultimately selfish.

I want you gentlemen, if you will be so good, if you look upon this as I do, if you believe this is practicable, as the President and Col. Roosevelt believe it is, if you believe this thing is wise, that it is a statesmanlike thing, I want you to see that the members of the Committee on Appropriations, or whatever committee has charge of it, shall bring it to the front at once. We can not wait. We have waited too long.

I made this suggestion to the President and to Congress last May. We ought to have taken it up then. The time is ripe now. We need a word of encouragement from the Government of the United States to these men before there develops in them any feeling that the Government is not appreciative of what they have done. It has got to be done some time, gentlemen; why not now? You have been thinking in large sums of money; you have passed in a day bills appropriating billions of dollars.

Can we not get to the point where we can visualize the opportunities and necessities of peace as well as the necessities of war? You are going to make this continent by the expenditure of large sums of money, and it is going to support three or four hundred million people; you will have 200,000,000 before this century is out. We are growing at the rate of about sixteen or seventeen million every 10 years, or we were before the war. We have got to have a place for these people. We want to show you a plan by which they can be taken care of.

One-third of our tillable land outside of the mountains is already occupied and in use. We want to see that the other two-thirds is used and used by men who are Americans, who are tied to the soil, and who are identified with us in interest as well as in heart.

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT

[House Report 216, Sixty-Sixth Congress, First Session.]

NATIONAL SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT.

AUGUST 1, 1919.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following

REPORT.

[To accompany H. R. 487.]

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 487) providing employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the national soldier settlement act, having considered the same, report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass, with sundry amendments which appear at the end of this report.

The committee has given the most patient and thorough consideration to the matter of framing a comprehensive constructive program in the interest of our returning soldiers.

Broadly, the problem is how to absorb them into our national life on terms that shall be satisfactory to them and profitable to the Nation. Specifically, the problem as presented in all of the bills referred to the committee is how to furnish them with immediate employment and to open the way to self-sustaining homes on the land, and how to furnish them with the necessary capital.

The basis of the discussion has been H. R. 487, introduced by Representative Mondell, of Wyoming, but the committee has encouraged the freest expression of opinion on every aspect of the subject. As a consequence, the testimony has covered a wide range, and developed a variety of opinion. But there is one thing on which all agreed: *Something should be done for the soldier.* As a means of showing how the committee has reached its own conclusions, it will be helpful briefly to review various propositions which have been advanced as substitutes for the legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, indorsed by the President, and embodied in several bills that have come to the committee.

VARIOUS SUBSTITUTES PROPOSED.

1. *A bonus for all soldiers.*—This has been proposed in three different forms: (a) Three hundred dollars for each enlisted man, which would require a total appropriation of \$1,200,000,000; (b) a bonus of \$25 per month for each month in service, which would amount to about the same total if the average length of service was one year; (c) a bonus of \$5,000 for each soldier, which will call for \$20,000,000,000.

2. *Individual farm loans.*—These have been proposed for various amounts and purposes, but all on the basis of the "infiltration plan," a term now commonly used to describe the method of individual settlement on scattered farms, as distinguished from the plan of community settlement. It has been proposed: (a) That a flat sum of \$4,000 be offered to each soldier for the purchase of an approved farm wherever he may select it, such advance to be made upon the basis of 100 per cent of the value, at 4 per cent interest, payable in 40 years. If all soldiers accepted the offer, it would call for an appropriation of \$16,000,000,000; (b) the same proposition with a maximum loan of \$10,000, which would call for \$40,000,000,000 if accepted by all; (c) the same proposition extended to cover advances for necessary improvements, live stock, and equipment; (d) the same proposition, except that the loan shall be elastic in amount, ranging down to 50 per cent of value.

3. *Loans for city or country homes.*—That every man returned from the colors be offered a loan of \$2,500 at a low rate of interest (4 per cent suggested), payable over 40 years' time, provided he invest the money either in a farm or in acquiring a home in city or town. Assuming the unanimous acceptance of this proposition, it would call for \$10,000,000,000.

4. *Loans for all lines of business.*—That soldiers desiring to engage in any line of business be provided with loans of various amounts, ranging up to 100 per cent of the necessary capital. It is impossible to estimate the appropriation that would be required, but the idea is for the Nation to supply the financial backing for every soldier who desires to engage in trade, industry, or profession, of whatever nature.

5. *Advancing money to the States.*—That \$500,000,000 be apportioned among the several States on the basis of the number of men supplied to the colors, and that the States be permitted to use the money in any way they consider best for the soldier's welfare. The same suggestion was made on the basis of a larger but indefinite appropriation.

6. *Leave it to private capital.*—That the matter be left entirely to private capital to finance, with helpful cooperation on the part of the Government in safeguarding any proposition for investors and settlers.

The problem of dealing with disbanded armies.—The problem we are facing is not new in human history. It has been the problem of all countries after all great wars, and it is preeminently the problem of all countries to-day. "From Rome under Cæsar, to France under Napoleon, down even to our own Civil War," said Secretary Lane in his letter of May 31, 1918, to the President and Members of Congress, "the problem arose as to what could be done with the soldiers to be mustered out of the military service."

There are two considerations to be borne in mind in dealing with the question: The first is the welfare of the soldier himself. It is incumbent upon Congress to see that no man who offered his life to protect the Nation in time of war shall come to want in time of peace. Every soldier who needs employment upon being discharged from the Army should have employment; and, so far as possible, employment at some congenial task. Moreover, it will be desirable in many instances to provide the soldier with a permanent occupation, and this should be of such a nature as to lead in the direction of genuine economic independence. The second consideration to be observed is, of course, the welfare of the Nation.

The American stock is of the colonizing breed. Not only the descendants of our earliest settlers but even our latest immigrants belong to the element which does not rest content with existing conditions, but constantly seeks to better them by reaching out to new opportunities in new lands. Our great patrimony of free public lands has been the safety valve of the Republic in the past. Lord Macaulay predicted that when this was gone—"then will come the real test of your institutions." If there was any measure of truth in the prediction, the present moment carries a challenge to the genius of American statesmanship, for the free public lands suitable for agriculture without irrigation are practically gone. Nevertheless, if the past is any guide for the present and the future, this is a challenge which must be accepted in order that the Nation shall remain sound and wholesome, and that man's conquest over the resources of nature shall go on in this and in coming generations.

In this connection it is worth while to recall how the veterans of the Revolution made their way through the almost trackless forests of the Alleghenies and planted the seeds of the great civilization we now behold both north and south of the Ohio River. It is well to recall how the veterans of the Civil War completed the occupation and development of the great region watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries, carrying their homes and farms to the extreme limit of the district where crops are assured by natural rainfall, and to the very threshold of the arid region.

There is another lesson which it is very important for us to learn from the past. The number of veterans who actually availed themselves of land opportunities at the close of former wars was small as compared with the total number engaged. Even so, the invitation to go on with the development of natural resources was effective not only in meeting the needs of the discharged soldier, but in steadying the whole fabric of industry and society at the most critical periods in our history.

As has already been said, the problem of how best to provide for the welfare of the returning soldier is not our problem alone, but equally that of all other countries. It is interesting to observe that the other great English-speaking countries—England, Canada, and Australia—are turning to the land as a means of meeting the need of the hour. England has a density of population equal to that of any American State. Its last acre of free public land disappeared centuries ago. And yet England is finding room upon her crowded soil to make more homes and farms for her soldier boys, and she is backing them in the new adventure with her money and credit.

Canada and Australia have adopted most generous policies in this regard, as fully set forth in the report of the Secretary of the Interior on H. R. 487.

LEADING PRINCIPLES OF A SOUND POLICY.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the committee has decided that it is unquestionably the duty of Congress to enact legislation with the least possible delay which shall make provision for the welfare of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines; and that such legislation should be based on these principles:

First. The continuation of our historic policy of opening the way to work and homes on the land for the veterans of our wars.

Second. In the absence of any considerable area of public land suitable to the purpose, the acquisition of lands now in private ownership followed by such improvement as may be necessary, either by clearing, fertilizing, draining, or irrigating, in order to render them fit for the best forms of agriculture.

Third. The employment of soldiers wherever practicable in all departments of the work to be done on the basis of current wages to the end (a) that opportunities for remunerative work may be supplied to those who need or desire it, and (b) that the soldiers may have opportunity to accumulate the amount of money that will be required as first payment upon property subsequently allotted to them.

Fourth. The advance of limited sums of money to be used by the settlers in the construction of permanent improvements, such as houses, barns, and fences, and of other limited sums for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, always with a reasonable margin of security for the Government.

Fifth. The subdivision of lands into lots, farm-workers' tracts and farms and the disposal of such property upon such terms as shall, in a period of not more than 40 years, reimburse the Government for its entire outlay, with interest at 4 per cent per annum.

Sixth. The provision of reasonable safeguards against speculation in farm allotments, to the end that permanent homes shall be made in good faith.

Seventh. The colonization of soldier settlers in groups of sufficient size to enable them to take advantage of every opportunity for economy and efficiency in the purchase of supplies and sale of products and for organized social life; also to permit them to receive the full benefit of community-created values.

Eighth. The absolute solvency of the entire enterprise, alike from the standpoint of the Government and the soldier settler, and the authorization of a total expenditure of not more than \$500,000,000, but with actual appropriations made from time to time as particular projects shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

SUBSTITUTE PROPOSALS CONSIDERED.

The adoption of these fundamental principles necessarily eliminates from consideration some of the ideas which have been suggested as substitutes for H. R. 487.

The proposition for a bonus to be given to all enlisted men, involving a total immediate outlay ranging from one billion to twenty billion dollars, is not within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Practically the same observations apply to the proposal to advance capital for the purpose of setting soldiers up in any and every line of business. Except as it deals with lands now owned or hereafter to be owned by the Government, it is not within the jurisdiction of this committee.

The proposal to leave the entire question of providing for the soldiers' welfare to private enterprise and capital is, of course, in conflict with what the committee regards as the plain duty of Congress at this time, while the proposition to advance money to build or purchase homes in cities and towns is a matter which should be embodied in separate legislation, if at all. In that case, it would be the business of some other committee.

DANGERS OF INFILTRATION.

The infiltration plan is different, and, upon superficial consideration, may be regarded as a somewhat satisfactory substitute for H. R. 487. On careful analysis, however, the committee has been unable to adopt it, notwithstanding the fact that it undoubtedly commands the earnest support of some of the sincerest friends of the movement to establish the soldiers upon the land.

In the first place, it would call for the expenditure of a vast sum of money and could not be made a sound, solvent proposition for the Government, at least if it authorized a loan for 100 per cent of the value of the property purchased, while if it did not authorize a 100 per cent loan it could be availed of only by soldiers possessing a considerable amount of money. This is true because it does not offer one hour's employment; hence, no opportunity whatever for the soldier to earn and accumulate money against the time when he will enter into the possession of his farm. For the same reason it provides no means for getting the necessary live stock, implements, and other equipment, or the necessary working capital.

The soldier settler, possibly devoid entirely of agricultural knowledge, experience, or training, would be suddenly thrown upon a farm subject to a mortgage of 100 per cent, without a horse, a cow, or a chicken; without plow, harrow, or any other agricultural tools, and without a dollar in the bank to enable him to live and make his crop. At least that would be the precise situation in very many instances; or, if not, then we would have simply shut the door in the face of the soldier whose sole assets are strong arms and a sturdy heart—the very man who merits first consideration.

In other words, the infiltration plan fails utterly to meet the situation in which a very large proportion of our soldiers find themselves at the time of demobilization.

It is argued that many more soldiers would purchase farms if they could borrow 100 per cent and locate wherever they chose, than would do so under the plan of community settlement. Undoubtedly this is true, especially if they are permitted to sell the farm at any time, as is proposed by most of the advocates of infiltration.

Analyze this argument and what do you find? First, a demand for an immediate appropriation of, say, \$10,000,000,000. This figure is named by the advocates of the plan on the basis of an average loan of \$5,000 and the expectation that at least 2,000,000 men would borrow the money, buy a farm, and take their chances in working it

or trying to sell at a quick profit. But in considering the effects of the policy we must assume that the entire 4,000,000 soldiers would have the right to borrow \$5,000 each, on condition that they immediately bought farms.

Now suppose it were announced to-morrow that the credit of the United States, to the extent of \$20,000,000,000, the aggregate amount of all four Liberty loans, has been made available for this purpose, what would be the effect on the market for country lands? Nothing less than the imagination of Jules Verne could picture the result. We should witness the greatest orgy of speculation in the history of the world. No scheme of official appraisalment that could be devised could possibly protect the soldier and the country from imposition in the sale of unfit properties at exorbitant prices. The law of supply and demand would itself go very far to boost land prices out of sight, and that at a time when existing land values are at the highest level in the history of the United States—three times as great as in 1900, 19 years ago. Four million buyers standing in line scattered over every State and every county, over every city, town, and hamlet from Maine to California, from the Lakes to the Gulf, each with \$5,000 spot cash to pay for a farm. It staggers the imagination. We reel under the thought of the consequences, even the first consequences, not to think of the ultimate outcome, the final aftermath—the “morning after.”

Even under normal conditions, without artificial inflation of prices already extremely high, the soldier settler purchasing a going and paying farm in an established community would be at a disadvantage as compared with a soldier who takes advantage of “the ground floor” proposition proposed by community settlement. Nothing works more inexorably than the law of unearned increment, and in every well-established community this law has already ground its grist. On the other hand, where large tracts of unimproved land are acquired and put in condition for cultivation by wholesale operations, and where there is a simultaneous movement of hundreds of families practically at one time, followed by the creation of many public and private improvements, the law of unearned increment works to the advantage of the settler.

In the one case he is the *victim* of the law; in the other, the *beneficiary*. In the one case he *pays* the increment; in the other, he *gets* it. The history of a thousand communities throughout the United States might be cited in confirmation of this proposition, but a single instance will suffice. Let anyone consider the history of Salt Lake Valley in Utah, the earliest community settlement undertaken in the western half of the continent, and observe how the pioneer settlers were enriched to the extent of tens of millions by this principle, and he will certainly be convinced of the soundness of this view.

The conclusive argument against the infiltration plan, rests, however, not upon what might happen in the future, but upon what actually has happened in the past.

Australia has led the way in formulating policies to establish homes on the land. And Australia was beguiled by the plausible argument put forth in favor of infiltration. Australia tried it, found it an absolute failure, abandoned it, adopted community settlement in its place, found it gloriously successful, and is now extending it

beyond anything dreamed of at this time in the United States. Why should we adopt the model that failed in preference to the model that succeeded?

According to Dr. Elwood Mead, for nine years in charge of land settlement in Australia, as he now is in California, Australia found that it was practically impossible for the government to exercise any effective supervision over settlers located on scattered farms. Official supervision of settlers looking to the government for their entire capital is, of course, not only prudent but essential; first, at the time when farms are purchased, and then over the long period required for the settler to get firmly established on a solvent basis. But the mere overhead cost of travel and salaries for government agents proved prohibitive. There was constant danger that settlers would be imposed upon in the sale of farms. Every man who had a farm for sale pursued the man eligible to borrow government money for the purpose of buying his farm. There were many opportunities for collusion between sellers, buyers, and intermediary agents. The net result was that buyers did not get the worth of their money, while the government was unable to devise any system of effective protection for the settler or itself.

Precisely the same difficulties hampered the Government in its effort to look after the settler and to assist him to succeed. The system was inherently unworkable. Practically the same experience was had in England, and in consequence of the lesson learned at the cost of disappointment, hardship, and pecuniary loss, England has now adopted the plan of community settlement for the benefit of her returning soldiers, fixing the minimum unit at 100 families.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

The present bill has been perfected after consultation with many elements of citizenship representing many different parts of the United States. Soldiers, statesmen, sociologists, men of large affairs, practical farmers, gardeners, live-stock men, experienced administrators of the immensely successful Mormon colonization work in Utah—all have been consulted, in the hope of evolving a measure that should be founded on sound economic principles, yet made sufficiently elastic to fit the widely varying conditions which must be dealt with in different parts of the country.

The original idea was to develop projects in every State where feasible opportunities were found, and the latest reports are to the effect that such projects will be found in every State. The ideal project would be one which should offer a sufficient area to make possible complete community development and thus to afford the cooperation, assistance, encouragement, and stimulus to be found in a well-organized community. The bill, however, fixes no minimum unit either for the farm or the project. It will be entirely feasible, under the wide discretion granted to the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with State authorities, to develop a small number of contiguous farms. In this connection it is well worth while to quote the testimony of Arthur P. Davis, the Director of the United States Reclamation Service:

We know of an attractive tract in Pennsylvania, and quite a number in the State of New York: In Greene County, N. Y., there is a tract that I had better describe

as being typical of others that can probably be found in other parts of the Northeast, where the settlement is supposed to be rather dense.

Not far from Albany, in the Hudson Valley, is an area of eighteen or twenty thousand acres, already in farms, and with farm buildings. The farms are usually from 154 to 400 acres, and most of them are under cultivation, but the majority are farmed by tenants. The great majority of the farms in the group I speak of are listed for sale, and I should say that the majority of the farms that are offered for sale could, at the time I looked, last December, be purchased at less than the present value of the improvements.

Secretary Lane has also directed attention to opportunities in the northeastern States, as follows:

We have the land; we have it in every part of this country, in the North as well as in the South. One of the richest parts of the United States is Aroostook County, Me. Maine has been deserted in part in her farming regions because the boys have had a lust for the western country that I love, and I can not blame them for that; but they have left good farms there. In Massachusetts it may surprise you to know, perhaps, that we have one little section of country around Cape Cod where there is some of the richest land in the United States, and it has been proved so in the last two or three years; and in the body of the State they have very considerable quantities of land that needs to be cared for a little bit—cut-over land that has been deserted, that needs to be brought into shape—that will make good farm land. The same thing is true in New York.

It should be said that it is not proposed, as some critics have averred, to divert men from their own States and ask them to settle in "district swamps and deserts." The idea is to find opportunities of employment and homemaking in their own States and, so far as practicable, in their own districts, unless they prefer to go elsewhere. Since there will be an average fund of something more than \$10,000,-000 available for each State, it will be entirely possible to have many small projects in a given State, provided favorable opportunities are found. It will be possible also to create industrial settlements near centers of population where groups of soldiers engaged as wage earners may desire to make homes on very small farms and perpetuate the beneficent scheme of war gardens. In a word, the soldier-settlement fund is designed to assist soldiers in getting homes under the best conditions, as these shall develop in practical administration.

Attention should be called to the safeguards which will surround the expenditure of the large appropriation authorized in this bill. The first actual appropriation asked for will be very small, only sufficient to enable the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with various State commissions and enter into preliminary contracts for the acquisition of the needed lands. Each particular project and contract will then be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and, if approved, presented for the action of Congress. Under this system the danger of serious blunders in the selection of projects would be very small indeed. Four different agencies will be brought into action before a dollar is expended in actual development, viz: First, the Secretary of the Interior, with his well-equipped organization for investigation, acting in cooperation with the farm loan board of the district; second, the governors and their State commissions, who will doubtless cooperate with important civic bodies in their various States; third, the Committee on Appropriations, which must consider and pass upon each contract and project; fourth, both Houses of Congress, who must actually vote the appropriation before the money can be expended.

The project having been developed to a point where the lands, by restoration, clearing, drainage, or irrigation, or a combination of these, were in fit condition for utilization for farming, the area would be divided into farms of suitable size to support a family, and the price fixed on the farms, which in the aggregate will pay the cost of the project, the price of each farm to represent, as near as it is possible, its value compared with the total cost and the value of the other farms.

The soldier who has worked upon the project will be given the preference in the selection of farms, and a payment of 5 per cent of the value fixed is to be paid at the time the farm is allotted. Assuming the average value of \$5,000 or \$6,000 per farm, this would require an initial payment of \$250 to \$300, a sum which the soldier could save in anticipation of the projects during the period of the development of the project, which would be from one to three years.

After the farms have been allotted assistance is to be given the soldier in the making of his improvements, the maximum loan provided for this purpose being \$1,500, and not in excess of three-fourths of the cost or value of improvements. The soldier's contribution to improvements could, and undoubtedly in the majority of cases would, be in the form of labor. During or in connection with the making of his improvements the soldier could by his personal efforts and work easily contribute his 25 per cent of the total cost.

Provision is also made for loans to the soldier settler for the purchase of necessary livestock and equipment. The maximum of such loans being \$1,200, or 75 per cent of the total cost of necessary livestock, and 60 per cent of the cost of equipment. Here again the soldier's obligations under this class of loan could if necessary be met by his individual efforts. In fact, while it is assumed that in many cases the soldier would have some savings which he could utilize in getting a start, it is believed that a man starting at the beginning of one of these projects without any capital could, through industry and frugality, earn and save enough to meet his initial and other payments as they become due.

APPROVED BY PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

The late President Theodore Roosevelt advocated the soldier settlement policy, as proposed by Secretary Lane, in the last article which he wrote for the press. President Wilson has urged it upon Congress in two messages. The governors of 27 States have appointed commissions to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior, and all of these commissions have expressed their earnest interest in legislation of this character.

One of the strongest indorsements of the bill in its present shape has come from the officers of the Eastern States Agricultural Industrial Exposition, which has its headquarters at Springfield, Mass., but represents 10 Northeastern States—the six States of New England and New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. This organization represents some of the strongest business interests in the country, who have inaugurated great plans looking to the systematic renewal and restoration of a prosperous agriculture throughout the northeastern part of the United States. They have discovered the very intimate relationship between industrial and agricultural prosperity and find that the existing condition under which, in the State of Massachusetts, for example, 92.8 of their

entire population lives in cities, a very serious menace to their welfare. They are seeking, through the instrumentality of a permanent exposition at Springfield, to demonstrate that farming can be made a paying business and that it is possible to create more attractive conditions of rural life. These gentlemen have discovered that their work exactly parallels the policy embodied in the soldier settlement plan and have come to believe that the soldier will do as great a work for his country at home as he did abroad, while at the same time achieving an independence for himself. Hence they are urging the support of the measure by all the members from their 10 States.

DOES THE SOLDIER WANT IT?

The most vital question that can be asked in regard to this policy is this: Does the soldier want it? The answer is: *He does*. The American Legion has officially indorsed the bill after a careful consideration of its provisions. Up to the present writing 112,088 soldiers have made formal application for opportunities of employment and home-getting under the terms of this bill. The number, which is increasing every day, ranges all the way from 6,752 in Illinois to 80 in Delaware.

The most impressive evidence in respect to the soldiers is contained in letters from commanding officers with the American Expeditionary Forces in Germany. Maj. Gen. Mark L. Hersey, for example, in command of the Fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, was requested, among others, by Secretary Lane, to ascertain the feeling of his men. He states that he went into the matter "with a view to determining in actual figures the number of men in this division that would not only be interested in farming, but interested with sufficient definiteness to take up the work should the plan be put into effect." He reports in detail upon each regiment, the net result being as follows:

Present strength, officers and enlisted men, 23,363.

Number interested in soldier settlement plan, 4,595.

Gen. Hersey expresses his own opinion as follows:

The men who are returning to America from the European battle fields have given to their country the best they have. They have paid their debt to America; not in full perhaps, but in full up to the present time. It is up to the United States to take care of them; to exercise over them a proper degree of paternalism; to make them feel that what they have given up in order to come to the war will be made good by the Government. These men are coming with a higher respect for American institutions and for constituted authority than they ever had before. They are thoroughly good citizens who need only the ties that bind them to the land, that give them a sense of proprietorship in the soil, that impel each man to establish his own home and to rear his own family. All these your proposed plan should furnish. I am heartily in favor of it. I hope you may push it to a successful conclusion. Several of the division staff officers have received letters similar to the one that was sent to me. I might say that this letter voices their sentiments as well as my own.

The amendments to H. R. 487 adopted by the committee are as follows:

1. On page 2, line 8, after the word "provided," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

Provided, That the rights and benefits conferred by this act shall not extend to any person who, having been drafted for military service under the provisions of the selective-service act, shall have refused to render military service or to wear the uniform of a soldier of the United States.

2. On page 2, line 13, strike out the word "withdraw."
3. On page 2, line 14, strike out the word "and."
4. On page 2, line 14, after the word "deed," insert a comma and the words "or patents."
5. On page 2, line 14, after the word "No," insert the words "projects shall be finally selected and no."
6. On page 2, line 20, change the period after the word "Secretary" to a semicolon and add:

Provided, That if the governor or his representative shall fail to act, then the land commissioner, or the person performing the functions of land commissioner, in such State may act in his stead.

7. On page 2, line 22, change the period at the end of said line to a semicolon and add:

Provided, That the Secretary, with the approval of the President, may withdraw such public land as may be deemed necessary for the purposes of this act.

8. On page 3, line 5, strike out the words "for such purposes" and insert in lieu thereof "in administrative and other work for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act."

9. On page 3, line 9, strike out the figures "\$1,200," and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

10. On page 3, line 14, after the word "dedication" insert the words "of tracts."

11. On page 3, line 14, strike out the words "schools, churches."

12. On page 3, line 15, strike out the word "centers."

13. On page 3, line 17, strike out the words "as provided herein" and insert in lieu thereof the words "for the benefit of the project under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe."

14. On page 3, line 21, after the word "employed" insert the words "and rendered substantial service."

15. On page 3, line 22, after the word "of" insert the word "any."

16. On page 4, line 7, strike out the words "relative and comparative selling value" and insert in lieu thereof the words "selling value compared with the other units of the project, the aggregate not to exceed the total cost of the project."

17. On page 4, line 14, strike out the word "twenty" and in lieu thereof insert the word "ten."

18. On page 4, line 14, strike out the word "The" at the end of the line and in lieu thereof insert the word "All."

19. On page 4, line 22, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

20. On page 5, line 7, strike out the words "public and private."

21. On page 5, line 8, after the word "projects" at the end of section 7, add the following new paragraphs:

Every patent issued under this act shall expressly reserve to the United States a prior lien on the land patented superior to all other liens, claims, or demands whatsoever, for the payment of all sums due or to become due to the United States or its successors in connection with such lands under any project provided for in this act.

Except as otherwise herein provided no lands acquired under the provisions of this act shall in any event become liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to the issuing of the patent therefor: *Provided, however*, That such exemption shall not exceed a period of ten years from the date of the contract of purchase.

Lands acquired pursuant to this act shall be subject to State, county, municipal, and local taxation and assessment after a period of five years from the date of the execution of the contract of purchase in proportion as the amount paid bears to the purchase price. If the purchaser shall fail to pay such taxes or assessments, the same

may be paid from the fund hereby authorized and charged to the purchaser with interest at the rate provided by law for delinquent taxes in the State in which the land is located and shall be a lien on the property assessed.

22. On page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out the figures and words "\$800 at any one time," and insert in lieu thereof the figures and words "\$1,200 in the aggregate."

23. On page 5, line 16, change the figures "60" to "75."

24. On page 5, line 17, after the word "and," insert the figures and words "60 per cent of the cost of the."

25. On page 5, at the end of line 17, insert as a new paragraph the following:

Provided further, That in case of emergency the Secretary, in his discretion, may postpone the payment of any installment due, and may also make additional loans, not exceeding two-thirds of the amount of the soldier's cash investment in his farm, tract, or lot; such additional loans to bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, payable annually.

26. On page 5, line 22, after the word "furnish," insert the words "not less than."

27. On page 5, line 24, after the word "the," insert the words "selection, acquisition, or."

28. On page 6, line 2, after the word "by," insert the words "or to."

29. On page 6, line 3, change the period after the word "State" to a comma and strike out the word "He" in the same line and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

30. On page 6, line 6, substitute for section 10 of the bill the following:

SEC. 10. Expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this act shall be made out of appropriations made annually by the Congress therefor, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, submit to the Congress estimates of the amount of money necessary to be expended for carrying out any or all of the purposes authorized by this act, for which purposes the sum of \$500,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

31. On page 6 add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make full report of his proceeding under this act to the Congress on the first Monday of December of each year.

32. On page 1, in the title of the bill, after the word "forces" in line 2, of said title, insert the following words: "of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies."

Also after the word "reclamation" in line 3 of said title, insert a comma and the words "acquisition and development."

So that the title as amended shall read:

To provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies through the reclamation, acquisition, and development of lands to be known as the National soldier settlement act.

The bill as amended by the committee will read as follows:

A BILL To provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies, through the reclamation, acquisition, and development of lands, to be known as the "National Soldier Settlement Act."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies and have been honorably

separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army Reserve, and former American citizens who served with, and were honorably separated or discharged from, the military or naval forces of any of the nations allied against the Central Powers, and who have been repatriated, all of whom are hereinafter referred to as soldiers, there is hereby established a fund in the Treasury to be known as the "National Soldier Settlement Fund," hereinafter referred to as the "Fund," to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary," for the purposes herein stated and as hereinafter provided:

Provided, That the rights and benefits conferred by this act shall not extend to any person who, having been drafted for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, shall have refused to render military service or to wear the uniform of a soldier of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary is authorized to use the Fund for the purposes of this act. He may acquire by gift, purchase, deed in trust, or otherwise, the necessary lands for Soldier Settlement Projects, hereinafter referred to as "Projects," and may utilize and dispose of by contract, deed, or patent, public lands suitable for such purposes.

No projects shall be finally selected and no lands shall be acquired, however, unless the price to be paid and the conditions under which they are to be acquired shall be approved by (a) a representative of the governor of the State in which the lands are located; (b) an appraiser designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board; and (c) the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the governor or his representative shall fail to act, then the land commissioner, or the person performing the function of land commissioner in such State may act in his stead.

Projects shall be selected with a view to the development of one or more projects in each of the several States in which feasible projects may be found: *Provided*, That the Secretary, with the approval of the President, may withdraw such public lands as may be deemed necessary for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary is authorized through such agencies as he may provide to engage in such undertakings and do and perform such work as in his opinion is necessary for the permanent reclamation or development of the lands of projects, and when he deems essential to place them in condition for use and cultivation, including the building of essential public roads.

The Secretary shall, so far as possible, utilize the services of soldiers in administrative and other work for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act.

The Secretary may also, through agreement with soldiers, make provision for necessary improvements, but the contribution from the fund shall in no single case exceed \$1,500, nor in excess of three-quarters of the cost or value of the improvements.

SEC. 4. That the lands of projects shall be subdivided into farms suitable for the support of a family and in the discretion of the Secretary into smaller farm workers' tracts. Dedication of tracts may be made for community and other public purposes. Town sites suitable for the purposes of the project may be established, developed, and sold for the benefit of the project under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. That soldiers who are not the owners or proprietors of farms or rural homes shall be eligible as purchasers of a farm or farm workers' tract. Preference shall be given to those who have been employed and rendered substantial service in the development of any such projects, and as between applicants with a view of safeguarding the settler and the United States, so far as practicable, against loss or failure. The Secretary shall make regulations general in character, or applicable to specific projects, as to residence and cultivation with a view of carrying out the purpose of making the soldier settlements the permanent home of the soldier purchasers.

SEC. 6. That sale prices shall be fixed with a view of repaying the total cost of each project, and the price fixed for each farm, tract, or lot shall represent as nearly as practicable its selling value compared with the other units of the project, the aggregate not to exceed the total cost of the project. Approved applicants shall at the time of entering into contract of purchase make a first payment of 5 per centum of the sale price. The balance shall be paid in amortizing payments extending over a period to be fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed forty years. Sums advanced for improvements shall be repaid in amortizing payments extending over a period to be fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed ten years. All amortizing payments shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, payable annually, computed from date of contract. The contracts for the sale of the farms, tracts, and lots shall provide for cancellations and forfeitures of payments made under the contract for failure to comply therewith.

SEC. 7. Patents or deeds to project lands issued within five years from the date of contract of sale shall contain the condition that no transfer, assignment, mortgage,

or lease made during that period shall be valid without the approval of the Secretary, and no transfer, assignment, mortgage, or lease of any right, title, or interest held under a contract of sale shall be valid at any time without the approval of the Secretary. The Secretary shall make all necessary regulations for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this act and for safeguarding the interests of the settler and of the United States, and is authorized to issue patents or deeds for the lands embraced in farms, tracts, and lots within projects.

Every patent issued under this act shall expressly reserve to the United States a prior lien on the land patented superior to all other liens, claims, or demands whatsoever, for the payment of all sums due or to become due to the United States or its successors in connection with such lands under any project provided for in this act.

Except as herein otherwise provided no lands acquired under the provisions of this act shall in any event become liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to the issuing of the patent therefor: *Provided, however,* That such exemption shall not exceed a period of ten years from the date of the contract of purchase.

Lands acquired pursuant to this act shall be subject to State, county, municipal, and local taxation and assessment after a period of five years from the date of the execution of the contract of purchase in proportion as the amount paid bears to the purchase price. If the purchaser shall fail to pay such taxes or assessments, the same may be paid from the fund hereby authorized and charged to the purchaser with interest at the rate provided by law for delinquent taxes in the State in which the land is located and shall be a lien on the property assessed.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary is also authorized to make short-time loans from the fund, not to exceed \$1,200 in the aggregate, to a soldier settler for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, and provision shall be made for the repayment of such loans during a period not to exceed five years with interest on deferred payments at 4 per centum per annum, payable annually, computed from date of contract: *Provided,* That no such loans shall exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the live stock and 60 per centum of the cost of the equipment purchased: *Provided further,* That in case of emergency the Secretary in his discretion may postpone the payment of any installment due and may also make additional loans, not exceeding two-thirds of the amount of the soldier's cash investment in his farm, tract, or lot; such additional loans to bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, payable annually.

SEC. 9. That whenever any State shall provide funds to be expended in cooperation with the United States to provide rural homes for soldiers, the Secretary shall have authority to enter into contracts for such cooperation, and when the State shall furnish not less than 25 per centum of the necessary funds the Secretary may authorize the State, subject to his general supervision, to carry on the selection, acquisition, or subdivision of the land, improvement of farms, and the aid and direction of development after settlement. The Secretary is authorized to provide for reimbursement of funds so advanced by or to the State, and may also cooperate with other agencies to the extent he may deem advisable and likewise provide for reimbursement to them of funds advanced.

SEC. 10. Expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this Act shall be made out of appropriations made annually by the Congress therefor, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, submit to the Congress estimates of the amount of money necessary to be expended for carrying out any or all of the purposes authorized by this Act, for which purposes the sum of \$500,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make full report of his proceedings under this Act to the Congress on the first Monday of December of each year.

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 487.

The undersigned members of the Committee on the Public Lands offer the following objections to H. R. 487, known as the "National soldier settlement act." Every Member of Congress is deeply interested in the nature of the legislation to be enacted in the interest of the future welfare of those who took part in the Great War. We are convinced that most Members who carefully investigate the proposition will agree with the minority that the proposed bill if adopted would discriminate against millions of men who fought in the war and impose upon the already overburdened taxpayer in an initial appropriation of \$500,000,000 a financial obligation altogether out of proportion to any possible good that might come out of it as it is framed.

The scheme proposed in this bill was first conceived in the fear that after the war was over millions of young men would return to this country and find themselves out of employment. This fear was entertained by the Secretary of the Interior who, six months ago, pointed out that men of vision who could look forward six months would realize their responsibility in the matter of providing jobs for the returned soldiers. Many men of standing had the same apprehension. But some economic phenomena occurred. Three quarters of the soldiers have returned to civil life and there is a great shortage of labor in the cities and on the farms. The first three words descriptive of the bill H. R. 487 are "to provide employment," but it was acknowledged before the committee and is printed in the hearing that this feature of the bill does not obtain at the present time. This fact was admitted by every witness who testified before the committee, including Director Davis of the Reclamation Service, who has had as much to do with the general proposition as any one man. We have witnessed the complete collapse of the contention that the Government will have to give work to any great percentage of soldiers in order that they may not suffer by being out of employment. Yet this bill, stripped of its very vitals, so far as its urgent necessity is concerned, deprived of the original excuse given for its birth, is still urged upon Congress. Now it is offered as an appreciation of the soldier, a reward for his service and what he endured. That being the case, the measure must now be judged by its fairness to all the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been honorably discharged from the service of the United States. Surely it must generally be accepted that if the Government recognizes the principle involved in offering assistance and opportunity to the men who were in the service, then the Government must adopt an equitable measure, one that will carry provisions for every man and not only for a few, as is proposed in this bill. The United States must not discriminate in dealing with the soldier.

If helpful legislation is enacted, it must be for all. The testimony in the printed hearings of this committee shows that while this bill

authorizes an appropriation of \$500,000,000, not more than 80,000 soldiers of the 4,500,000 could be provided for in the expenditure of this amount of money. Only those soldiers who care to go on a farm would be aided; only those soldiers who care to live in community centers would receive consideration. But let us examine how much is done by this bill even for the few thousands who come within its scope. The average soldier by the provisions of this bill must have, it is admitted by the proponents of this measure, approximately \$1,200. He must make an initial payment on the price of the farm of 5 per centum of the sale price. He will be loaned for necessary improvements \$1,500 only after he has invested a quarter of that amount himself; he will be loaned \$1,200 for the purchase of necessary live stock, only after he has put into it a quarter of that amount himself. If a soldier is penniless he will be given a job on one of these great projects. It is claimed that on a wage of from \$3 to \$4 per day he will be able to support a wife and family and in from three to five years save the \$1,200 that it will be necessary for him to pay down before he will be allowed to settle on one of the farms he has worked to reclaim. If the projects have been completed, but the men who worked on it have been unable to save the money for initial payment, it will be no concern of Uncle Sam. They will have reclaimed the farms in the swamps of the South, the arid lands of the West, or cut-over lands in other parts. They toiled but their work is done and they must seek employment in some other quarter while Uncle Sam sells the farms to some other soldiers who have \$1,200 but who perhaps did not work on the project. It must be remembered that the soldier must pay back to the Government every cent he borrowed with 4 per centum interest and the total cost of the farm must also be paid. It is not only possible but probable that the cost of the farm to the soldier will be greater than what a farm would have cost him outside of the Government project and nearer to markets. All the overhead expense of the entire proposition will have to be borne by the soldier. He will have to pay for the extravagance of Government administration; his will be the obligation for all mistakes that may be made. Every cent of expense will be added up by the Department of the Interior and the soldier will be handed the bill.

The testimony of the proponents of the bill shows that the scheme which was originally to provide employment for soldiers has become a great reclamation project. But such a colossal plan for reclamation of lands would never have even been seriously considered had it not been possible to link the name of the soldier with it. And soon the inevitable selfish interests appeared. Men who have much to gain in the upbuilding of certain localities began to talk about "helping the soldier," the while he labored industriously in behalf of this bill which proposes not to reclaim public lands only but for the most part that the Government shall buy the land that they shall afterwards reclaim and sell to the soldier. A publicity agent was put to work spreading propaganda all over the country. With every Member of Congress favorable to the enactment of some legislation for the soldiers' welfare, an agent was employed by the Southern Settlement & Development Co. With brazenness amounting almost to effrontery this press agent attended all open meetings of the committee and then gave to the papers of the country glowing accounts of what was claimed to be the beneficial provisions of this measure for the soldier.

This press agent was not employed by the soldiers who were supposed to benefit by this legislation, nor by the Department of the Interior, so that there is a natural conclusion that private interests had something at stake.

We hold that soldiers must be allowed to exercise their individual choice in the location of their tracts of land. We contend that the land proposed would, when reclaimed, cost the soldier more than equally as good, or, in many instances, better land would cost him in localities where agriculture is a proven success. The great agricultural States of Illinois and Iowa have been brought to their great perfection through individual initiative. The best improved lands of Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, are selling from \$200 to \$500 an acre; a very small tract in one of these States will support a family in comfort. There are in the New England States, and in Ohio and Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia, many abandoned farms that are awaiting profitable cultivation. We are told that these lands can be bought for less than cost of the improvements. Many an ambitious young soldier with a small loan on long time at a low interest rate would have there a much better promise of success. We believe that the plan submitted in H. R. 487 will be a most expensive failure because the bill as it is presented will not appeal to enough soldiers to make it a success.

The members of the committee signing this minority report are in favor of extending an opportunity to every soldier, sailor, or marine of this war or any other war. It being claimed that H. R. 487 recognizes the principle of aiding the soldier, we would do the fair thing and include all. We would provide for the city soldier an opportunity to buy a home with the aid of the credit of the Government of the United States; we would provide for the young farmer soldier a chance to buy a farm all ready for cultivation right in his own State and among the relatives and friends of his lifetime. It should not be necessary that this boy because he went to war should have to forever give up the family ties and go into a settlement where there would be a community of former soldiers, and for him to give up all the companionships of his youth. We would divide whatever money Congress appropriates between the States in accordance with the proportions of soldiers furnished by the State. Let there be reclamation in States where it is feasible. We would reclaim and develop the lands; we would provide an antidote for Bolshevism by encouraging and helping the man in the city to own his home; we would avoid all suspicion of hypocrisy by doing exactly for the soldier what we claim to do in the bill.

As many different measures are now pending in Congress to provide opportunity for the soldiers, and as Congress is about to take a recess at the time we are obliged to file this report, we defer making any specific recommendation, but at the proper time, when H. R. 487 is called before the House, we will offer such propositions as we are convinced will give every soldier the opportunity Congress believes he should have.

BERTRAND H. SNELL.
CHAS. A. NICHOLS,
HAYS B. WHITE,
JOHN S. BENHAM.

INDEX.

	Page.
Atkeson, Thomas C., representative National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry	69, 351
Baker, Hon. Newton D., Secretary of War	518
Bashure, Capt. Ellis, financial section United States Army	328
Boies, Hon. W. D., Representative from Iowa	204
Brannin, Carl, secretary Farmers' Single Tax League	222
Chamberlain, Hoyt, secretary National Civic Betterment League	77
Chisholm, D. V., legislative representative Spanish-American War Veterans	157
Cole, Gen. Charles H., Boston, Mass., Twenty-sixth Division	105
Cox, J. N., representing governor of Tennessee	415
Davis, Hon. A. P., director Reclamation Service	129, 429, 480
Davis, Hon. D. W., governor of Idaho	271
Drane, Hon. Herbert J., Representative from Florida	348
Drummond, W. I., chairman board governors International Farm Congress	502
Ferris, Hon. Scott, Representative from Oklahoma	677
Gandy, Hon. Harry L., Representative from South Dakota	381
Garner, Hon. John N., Representative from Texas	187
Gibson, John I., Michigan Land Settlement Commission	147
Gooding, Hon. F. R., former governor of Idaho	228
Green, W. R. jr., Buhl, Idaho, formerly United States Army	761
Hallan, H. C., publicity agent, Southern Settlement and Development Organization	653
Hansen, William L., Salt Lake City, bishop and manager colonization department, Mormon Church	728
Harris, John J., president and general manager Big Horn Irrigation & Power Co., Montana	678
Hastings, Hon. W. W., Representative from Oklahoma, letter from	751
Hathorn, H. Guy, investment banker, Memphis, Tenn.	260
Hunter, H. F., supervisor of agriculture, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad	130
Jeffries, Hugh, president American Military Reform Association	694
Kent, Hon. William, United States Tariff Commission	176
Lane, Hon. Franklin K., Secretary of the Interior	30
Layton, Hon. Caleb R., Representative from Delaware	476
Lehmann, Emile A., former private, Company D, 326th Infantry, United States Army	647
Littlejohn, Capt. K. S., United States Engineers	471
Lund, Mrs. Haviland H., secretary of the Forward-to-the-Land League	558
Marsh, Benjamin C., Farmers' National Council	388
Meehan, J. Leo, chairman soldiers' settlement committee, Utah, American Legion, letter from	778
Miller, John D., representative Dairymen's League	629
Mondell, Hon. F. W., Representative from Wyoming	3, 23, 52, 595
Morgan, Hon. Dick T., Representative from Oklahoma	280
McCracken, Hon. Robert M., former Representative from Idaho	643
McDuffie, Hon. John, Representative from Alabama	424
McElroy, Col., National Tribune, Grand Army of the Republic	159
Nelson, Wilbur A., secretary Tennessee Soldiers' Settlement Board	167
Oxley, Mrs. W. H., representing herself, Washington, D. C.	669
Park, Hon. Frank, Representative from Georgia	255
Porter, Charles D., president Orleans County Farm Bureau Association	631
Richards, J. H., attorney, from Boise, Idaho	97

	Page.
Robertson, Hon. J. B. A., governor of Oklahoma.....	247
Rosenthal, E. Philip, Human Welfare Association.....	331
Saulsbury, F. A., president Ontario County Farm Bureau Association.....	630
Secretary of the Interior, report of.....	Appendix A
Shepherd, R. E., Jerome, Idaho.....	555
Sinnott, Chairman N. J., report for committee to the House.....	Appendix B
Springer, Charles, representing governor of New Mexico.....	416
Spry, Hon. William, former governor of Utah.....	778
Starr, Western, Farmers' National Single Tax League.....	204
Sterling, Henry, legislative agent American Federation of Labor.....	81
Summers, Hon. J. W., Representative from Washington.....	423
Timberlake, Hon. Charles B., Representative from Colorado.....	93
Titus, Elwood W., representative New York State Federation of Farm Bureaus.....	618
Wilson, Hon. Riley J., Representative from Louisiana.....	113
Wilson, Hon. William B., Secretary of Labor, letter from.....	755
Wood, Hon. William R., Representative from Indiana.....	531



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 016 690 0

